

10 Rd

A
T R E A T I S E

Against the

Nonconforming Nonjurors.

In ANSWER to the

OBJECTIONS which Mr. DODWEL,
Dr. HICKES, Dr. SIMON LOWTH, Mr.
COLLIER, Mr. HOWEL, Mr. EARBERRY,
Mr. WHISTON, Dr. BRETT, and others,
have brought against the *Church of England.*

VOL. II. 122g

By GEORGE RYE, D.D. Rector
of *Islip*, and Chaplain to the Right
Honourable the Earl of DERBY.

L O N D O N :

Printed for D. B R O W N E at the *Black-Swan*, and
F. C L A Y at the *Bible and Star*, without *Temple-Bar*,
M D C C X I X.

X

14

THE BRITISH



VOL. II


By George Ryd, D.D. Rector
of the said Church, and Chaplain to the Right
Honorable the Earl of Derby.

LONDON

MDCCLXX

18: 11 REATISE
S E C T. III.

Supposing, what is evidently false, that the Nonjuring Bishops had been Deprived by Lay Powers which had been only Supreme de facto, we might and ought to have submitted to the New Bishops constituted in their room.

 Have now shewn, that the Nonjuring Bishops were deprived by the Ecclesiastical Power; and so were rightfully Deprived, even according to the Principles of our Adversaries. I have also proved, that the Lay Power has Authority to Deprive Criminal Bishops, and confirmed it from the Sense and Practice of the *Primitive Church*, and shewn it to be agreeable to the Constitution

stitution of the *English Church*, from the *Seventh Century* to the *Present*, And I have fully answered the Objections of our Adversaries; and particularly, as to the Examples and Testimonies from Antiquity which they have heaped together with so great Pains, and urge with so much Ostentation. I have either turned them against themselves, or made it plain, that they are nothing to the Purpose. And therefore, the Nonjuring Bishops were rightfully deprived, even supposing their Deprivation to have proceeded, as our Adversaries falsely pretend, merely from the Lay Power: and the Bishops who succeeded in their Dioceses, were rightfully chosen and placed there; and the Nonconforming Nonjurors are Schismatics for opposing those Bishops, and not we for adhering to them. And here I might well stop, having fully vindicated our Spiritual and Civil Governors: but since this Treatise is chiefly designed for the Benefit of the Nonjurors, I shall shew that

Supposing, but not granting the Nonjuring Bishops to have been Deprived by Lay Powers which had been only Supreme *de facto*, we might and ought to have submitted

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 183

mitted to the new Bishops constituted in their Room.

This is a Supposition, which one would think there could be no need of making, because the late King *William's* Title, and consequently that of his present Majesty, has been fully and clearly made out, and all the Objections and even Cavils against it thoroughly examined and solidly confuted; and our Adversaries have never produced any substantial Answer; which if they had been able, they might as securely have done, as they did for several Years publish weak Answers, and even virulent Libels against the Constitution. But let us suppose for Argument-sake, that the Nonjuring Bishops had been Ejected by Powers which had been Supreme only *de facto*; yet then the Church might and ought to have submitted to the new Bishops.

This our Adversaries will readily grant; if it shall appear, that the Dioceses of the *Nonjurors* were void; because then the Objection that our Bishops set up Altar against Altar falls to the Ground. Now a Diocese may become void, not only by Deprivation, but by Voluntary Cession. Mr. *Dodwel* indeed asserts, that the Deprived Bishops *insisted on their Right (c)*: But he

(c) *Vindication*, p. 13.

does not assert, much less prove, that they insisted on their Right immediately upon their Deprivation. And if they first made a Cession, and afterward thought fit to revive their Claim, that Claim could be of no Force. Now for ought that our Adversaries have yet made out, it appears, that the Deprived Bishops did themselves submit to their Deprivation, and made a Cession of their Dioceses, tho' not in Words, yet by Deeds, which are stronger than Words.

Our Adversaries love to quote the Example of St. *Chrysostom* to justify their Non-conformity : But he was as unlike them in this, as I shall hereafter shew him to have been, in other Respects. When the Synod *Sub Quercu* Deprived him, he protested against their Authority and the Validity of their Sentence to that Synod it self, to the Emperor, to all the Bishops of the *East*, and to the Bishops of *Rome*, *Milan*, *Aquileia* and *Carthage*, and the whole *West*. So that scarce any private Member of his Diocese, or any Bishop throughout the World, but knew, that he had from the very first kept up his Claim. Notwithstanding many Messages and Commands, he would not desist from executing his Episcopal Office, till he was forced out of his Church and Diocese into Banish-

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 185

Banishment. As for his Adherents, they immediately upon his Deprivation, and before any Successor was constituted, withdrew from his Deprivers and their Adherents, and formed separate Religious Assemblies. So that nothing could be more notorious than that St. *Chrysostom* never made any Cession of his Diocesan Right.

But the Behaviour of the Deprived Bishops was the Reverse of all this. They were suspended by Act of Parliament, *August 1. 1689.* and Deprived *ipso facto* the 1st of *February* following. Yet they did not enter any publick Protest against the Authority of that Parliament, nor against the Suspension or the Deprivation. After they were Suspended, they in all outward Appearance acquiesced, forbearing to act as Bishops of their respective Dioceses. Without being locally banish'd or forc'd from their Dioceses, they all of their own accord retreated from them to *London*, except Bishop *Frampton*, who continued to communicate with our Church, and thereby own'd the Title of his Successor. They did not protest against the Nomination, Election, Confirmation, Consecration or Instalment of their Successors. They did not either formally or virtually challenge the

the Obedience of the People of their respective Dioceses in any publick Manner; nor warn them, that they ought to avoid the Communion of the Schismatical Antishops, as they are now called. It may perhaps be objected, that there would have been Danger in their doing so. But that will by no means excuse them, nor lessen the Right which the Church had, upon being deserted by them, to submit to the Bishops constituted in their Room.

But should we farther suppose, that the Deprived Bishops had made no Cession, but from the first insisted on their pretended Right; yet still we might and ought to have submitted to the new Bishops constituted in their room; as will appear from the following Considerations.

It is manifestly *necessary* for the Welfare of the Church to enjoy the free and open Exercise of Religion, and the use of publick Churches; that her Clergy should be permitted to discharge their sacred Functions, and her People to attend them in their Ministrations; particularly that her Bishops should have Liberty publickly to govern, visit, confirm and ordain, and that their Clergy and People should be suffered to resort to them for their fatherly Direction and Assistance. And
this

this our Adversaries cannot deny. For if they think these Privileges to be needless; why do they complain so loudly of Persecution on Account of their being refused them? Now, as the Church cannot prosper without these Privileges, so she cannot obtain them without the Protection of the State; and therefore the Protection of the State is abundantly more necessary for the Church, than it is, that any certain Person should govern any particular Diocese.

I may add, that it has been esteemed *convenient* for the Church, that she should enjoy the Countenance as well as the Protection of the Civil Power; that she should be received into the National Establishment; that none but her professed Members should be admitted into Civil Offices of Trust and Importance; that her Clergy should have a settled Maintenance; and that Baronies should be annexed to Bishopricks; which has given our Bishops a great Influence in Parliament, and upon many other important Occasions; and enables them to be in a good measure the Temporal Guardians, as well as the Spiritual Fathers of the Church. And those who have thought the Church to be in Danger, when there was in their Opinion a likelihood that the State would
re-

retrench some *one* of these Favours, cannot but conclude that it is more beneficial to the Church to preserve *all* of them, than at the Expence of them all to retain the Superintendency of any particular Bishop.

And to view these Matters in another Light, it is abundantly less pernicious to the Church to submit to the Deprivation of any particular Bishops by incompetent Powers, than to lose the Protection of the State; and especially than to bring the Church into a State of Persecution, and to exasperate the Civil Power not only to take away the Legal Establishment of the true Religion, but to set up a false one in opposition to it, and to prohibit the Clergy to officiate and the People to frequent Divine Service, and to banish or imprison such of the Bishops and Ministers who shall persevere in Officiating, and to amerce such of the People who shall join with such Clergy; and thereby perhaps to extirpate in that particular State the true Faith and Administration of the Sacraments, the Worship of God, and the Succession of the Ministry. And it is not impossible but this might have befallen us, if we had rejected the Bishops constituted in the Place of the Deprived Bishops; as it has in Fact befallen some particular

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 189

particular Churches, through the Rashness and Obstinacy of their respective Members.

For these Reasons it is the Duty, and always has been the Practice of those who ought to consult the Welfare of the Church, rather to acquiesce in the invalid Deprivations of particular Bishops, than by adhering to them to provoke the Prince, at least to withdraw his Protection and Favour, if not openly to persecute the Church. For how unreasonable and unjustifiable would it be to postpone publick to private Interest, by adhering to the Persons of a few Bishops, to hazard Episcopacy it self, and by contending eagerly for a Part, to endanger the whole Constitution of the Church?

The ancient Governours of the Church were not guilty of this Absurdity. They wisely submitted to Necessity, and had more regard to the Safety of the Church, than to the Concerns of particular Members; and prefer'd her Prosperity before any Persons or Rules, before any Considerations, except those Things which were Parts of Religion: particularly, when Bishops happen'd to be Deprived by incompetent Powers, if the Exigencies of Circumstances required it, they did

did not scruple to submit to those Deprivations, and to acknowledge the new Bishops.

About the Year 435, St. *Briccius* Bishop of *Tours*, was, on suspicion of Incontinency, ejected by the Inhabitants of that City: And first, one *Justinian* was placed in his room, who lived but a short Time; and then one *Armentius* was made Bishop, and continued so till he died; which was about Seven Years after. All this while St. *Briccius* did not acquiesce, but was applying at *Rome* to be restored: and yet there does not appear to have been any Division or Disturbance in the Church on this Occasion. On the contrary, *Gregorius Turo-nensis*, who flourished in the next Age, and was Archbishop of *Tours* himself, and wrote the History of this Affair (d), reckons *Justinian* and *Armentius* in the Catalogue of his Predecessors, Archbishops of *Tours* (e), and even St. *Briccius* him-

(d) *Historia Sua*, L. 2. C. 1. (e) For tho', *Lib.* 10. Cap. 31. he calls *Briccius* the 4th, and *Eustochius* the 5th Bishop from the Institution of the See: And so in St. *Briccius*'s Time, includes the Time in which *Justinian* and *Armentius* sat Bishops, probably because St. *Briccius* sat before and after them: Yet he calls *Perpetuus* the 5th, *Virus* the 7th, and *Licinius* the 8th, Bishops after St. *Martin*, (*Lib.* 2. Cap. 14, 26, 39.) which they could not be, unless *Justinian* and *Armentius* were included in the Number.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 191

self call'd *Armentius his Brother and Bishop of Tours* (f).

About the Year 950, *Berengarius* usurping Regal Power in *Italy*, did, without any Synod, eject *Joseph* Bishop of *Brixia*, and put one *Antony* in his room (g), who continued Bishop there, and acted as such in several Synods (h).

It were easy to bring many more Instances of this Nature, but that it is hard to know, what Princes our Adversaries will allow to be Rightful ones. They assert, that neither Possession, nor Conquest (i), nor forced Submission (k), nor Prescription (l), can give any Right. And I am perswaded, that few of them will agree, that the Election of the People can convey a good Title. And therefore they may perhaps think, that I ought rather to have ranged under this Head, the Instances which I produced under the last, of the Church's Submission to the *Macedonian* and *Roman* Deprivations of the *Jewish* Priests, and to

(f) *Fratrem nostrum Turonicum Pontificem.*

(g) *V. Luitprand. Lib. 5. c. 13. and after him Sigonius, Histor. Ital. L. 6. p. 162.*

(h) *V. Concil. Edit.*

L'Abbe, Tom. 9. Col. 635, 676, 678. (i) *Dr. Hickes, p. 41.*

(k) *Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic. p. 104.*

(l) *Dr. Hickes, p. 262.*

the *Imperial* and *Turkish* Deprivations of Christian Bishops; because the Title of most, if not all those Civil Governours, was only Possession, and forced Submission, or Prescription founded in such Possession and Submission. They may also be of Opinion, that the Emperor *Anastasius* was an Usurper, and that the Instances I mention'd, of Bishops Deprived by him, belong to this Class. For several Historians (*m*), give the following Account of his Accession to the Throne, *viz.* That the Emperor *Zeno* falling into a Fit, his Empress *Ariadne* buried him alive, and immediately put the Crown upon the Head of *Anastasius* and married him, tho' he was of an inferior Rank. *Zeno* coming to himself, earnestly intreated the Soldiers set to guard the Vault where he was laid, to release him. But they were forbidden to do it, and answered him, that another Man was now Emperor. *Zeno* persisted to implore their Pity, offering to retire into a Monastery; but all in vain: So that after having eaten his Buskins, and the Flesh off his Arms, he

(*m*) *Viz.* Cedrenus, Zonaras, Niceph. Callistes, L. 16. C. 24.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 193

was miserably starved to Death. This account is credited by *Baronius* (n), who in this Point seems to have had no extraordinary Reason to bias his Judgment.

But whatever Opinion our Adversaries may entertain of the Rightfulness of these several Princes, I can in this manner argue certainly from the Instances of Bishops Deprived by them. Either the Church submitted to those Deprivations, because she judged those Civil Governours to be Rightful, and that Rightful Civil Governours have Authority to Deprive; and then those Instances make good my second Proposition. Or else she judg'd, that those Civil Governours had no Authority to Deprive, and consequently, that their Deprivations were in themselves Null and of no Force; and yet she submitted to them for her own Peace and Safety; And then those Instances prove this third Proposition.

Object. 1. You ought not to have deserted the Deprived Bishops for fear of Persecution. For Christianity is a Doctrine of the Cross.

(n) *Ad annum 491. C. 3.*

Answ. True: Yet Christ commands us to flee Persecution, when we can Lawfully; and therefore to draw a Persecution upon our selves is not a Christian Virtue, but a sinful Presumption.

Object. 2. You ought not to have deserted the Deprived Bishops in order to preserve the Church, but to have left that Care to God.

Answ. Tho' God has promised that he will always be with the Universal Church, yet he has made no such Promise to any particular Church; and tho' a particular Church has good Reason to depend upon God's Protection, while she acts with due Caution and Prudence; yet she has no Reason to expect it, when she wilfully runs her self into Danger, which she might lawfully avoid. Because, as Dr. *Hickes* observes upon this very Subject (o), *God not only allows but requires us to use the Wisdom of the Serpent, to prevent our Extirpation.*

Object. 3. Disowning the Deprived Bishops was contrary to their Divine Right.

Answ. The express Laws of God have in some Cases yielded to this great

(o) P. 223.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 195

Law of Necessity. The Mosaical Law prohibited any but Priests to Eat the Shew-Bread: And yet our Saviour approves of the Example of *David* and his Men who did Eat of that Bread in a Case of extreme Hunger (p). The Fourth Commandment prohibits *all* Persons to do *any* Work on the Sabbath-Day; without mentioning or implying any Exception either as to Work or Persons, but rather the contrary. And yet our Saviour says, that we may, contrary to the Letter of this Commandment, do such Work as shall happen to be Necessary, *because the Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath* (q). And it is observable, that our Saviour speaks this with Relation to the *Disciples plucking the Ears of Corn and rubbing them in their Hands*; which does not seem to have been absolutely Necessary, but only Necessary in a lower Degree.

And as even Divine Laws may yield to Necessity, except in the Essentials of Religion: So it might be questioned, whether the Right of a particular Diocesan, tho' supposed to be in some Sort

(p) Mark 2. 25, 26.

(q) Mark 2. 27, 28.

Divine, ought not to be postponed to the Exigencies of the Church, since it was given him for her good: But I shall wave this Consideration; because I have already shewn under my Second Head, that Diocesan Right is not Divine but Human.

Object. 4. Rejecting the Deprived Bishops was contrary to their Canonical Right.

Answer. If even Divine Laws must yield to Necessity, except in the Essentials of Religion; much more must Canons. Canons were made for the Church, and not the Church for Canons. They were made by her Authority and for her Welfare; or in the Words of Scripture for *Peace, Order and Decency* (r), and therefore whatsoever Canon is manifestly and universally contrary to these Ends, is of it self null and of no force: And for the same Reason, whatsoever Canon does, in some particular Juncture of Time, become destructive to the Church, ceases to be of Force during that Juncture: For it would be as unreasonable to pretend the Authority of the Church to her own Ruin, as to levy War against a Prince by his own

(r) 1 Cor. 14. 33, 40.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 197

Commission. And accordingly, when a Canon has in some particular Circumstances proved pernicious to the Church, the Fathers judged, that the Canon ought in that Instance to give place to Necessity ; or which comes all to one, that the Canon was of no force in that Point, or that that Case ought to be understood to be excepted out of the Canon.

For Example ; a most ancient Rule of the Church was, that there should be but one Bishop in one City ; and this was confirmed by the *Nicene* Council ; and our Adversaries are continually mentioning this Rule as most Sacred : Yet *St. Augustine*, and all the Catholick Bishops in *Africa*, being near 300 in Number, proposed, in order to put an end to the Schism of the *Donatists*, that there should be two Bishops in each City, a *Donatist* and a *Catholick* one (*f*). Thus they were ready, for the Peace of the Church, to have set aside for a Time, this most Ancient and most Sacred Canon.

St. Cyprian writes (*t*), that it was a general Rule of the Church, that there

(*f*) *V. Collat. Carthag.* 1. *Di.* c. 16. *Augustin. Lib. de Gestis-cum Emerito.*

(*t*) *Epist.* 67.

198 A TREATISE against the

should be several Bishops to ordain a Bishop: And the first Apostolical Canon, and the fourth Canon of the Council of *Nice* requires, that at least two or three should be present to do it: Yet in the Reign of the Emperor *Valens*, when Heretical Factions prevail'd, *Philon* Bishop of *Syrene* did singly ordain *Siderius* Bishop of *Palabisca*; and *Athanasius* allowed of the Ordination, because of the Necessity of the Times (u).

About the same Time the great *Eusebius* Bishop of *Samosata*, disguised himself in a Soldier's Habit, and went about *Syria*, *Phenice* and *Palestine*, ordaining Presbyters and Deacons. This was contrary to those Canons, which prohibit a Bishop to ordain out of his own Diocese; and yet *Theodorit* (w) commends him for it. And *Theodorit* farther says, That *Eusebius*, whenever he found Bishops of the same Faith with himself, set them over such Churches as wanted Bishops (x); whereby *Valesius* and Dr. *Hickes* (y) understand, that these Persons were ordain'd Bishops by *Eusebius* alone. And *Valesius* observes upon

(u) V. Synesii, Epist. 67.

(w) H. E. l. 4. c. 13.

(x) Εἰ ὅποτε καὶ ἐπισκόπων ἐμογνωμόνων ἐπέτυχες, καὶ σεβόμενος ταῖς δεομέναις ἐκκλησίαις παρέββαλλετο.

(y) P. 221, 222.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 199

the Place, " Many things of the same
" Nature were done then, and at other
" Times, by the best Bishops; who when
" they saw the Christian Religion to be in
" Danger, used little to regard the Rules
" and Canons of the Church, so that they
" could but preserve the Church her
" self sound and whole. Therefore in
" such Dangers this Rule prevailed, *Let*
" *the Safety of the Church be the supreme*
" *Law.*

And lastly; Our Adversaries themselves allow, that we may, for the Peace and Safety of the Church, act contrary to her standing Rules; and perhaps their Authority may weigh more with some, than any Argument I have hitherto produced. Mr. *Dodwel* says, that *Canons have been yielded by the Orthodox for the sake of Peace* (z). It is an ancient Rule of the Church, that a Bishop should be elected and ordained in the publick Congregation. Now Dr. *Hickes* pleads very warmly (a), that our Adversaries are not bound to observe this Rule; and attempts to justify the *clandestine Consecrations of their pretended Bishops*, and *their not yet de-*

(z) *Case in Fact*, p. 33, 80.
222.

(a) P. 220, 221,

clarating openly who they are, from the Necessity of the Times; and because such a Declaration would endanger the Extirpation of their whole Community.

And particularly our Adversaries say that the Church may, for her good, submit to Deprivations, which are in themselves Null. The Author of the *Case of Schism* argues (b), that the Deprivation of *Abiathar* cannot be a Precedent for the Deprivation of a Bishop; *since there was little or no Damage to the Church in removing any one High-Priest, because there were still others legally empower'd to execute the same Office.* Which Words at least suppose, that the *Jews* might for that Reason, submit to the Deprivation of a Priest, and to acknowledge his Successor; otherwise this Argument is to no purpose. And Mr. *Dodwel* maintains (c), the Lawfulness of the *Jews* submitting to the Arbitrary Deprivations of the High Priests by the *Macedonians* and *Romans*, and acknowledging the Authority of those High Priests who were constituted in the Place of the Deprived ones, and of the *Greek Christians* acknowledging the Successors of such Patriarchs as are Deprived in the

(b) P. 20.

(c) *Defence of Vindicat.* p. 69, 61.

same

same unjust manner by the *Turkish* Emperors; because it is for *the publick Interest, and the Good of Mankind, and Government in general.* And this is in a Treatise which Mr. *Dodwel* wrote in Defence of the Nonjuring Non-Conformists, and which Dr. *Hickes* recommends (*d*), as containing all that can be said in their Defence.

As then Works of Necessity ought to be understood to be excepted out of the fourth Commandment, because the Sabbath was made for Man; and as it appears from Reason, and the Authority of the Fathers, and of our very Adversaries, that those Things which are commanded by the Letter of the Canons, but are destructive to the Church, ought to be understood to be excepted out of the Canons, because the Canons were made for the Church: So when it becomes destructive to the Church, that he who was Bishop of a certain Diocese should remain in it any longer; this ought to be understood to be a Case excepted out of those Canons, which give Diocesans, when once rightfully possessed, a Right for their Life to the Obedience of their respective

(*d*) P. 220

Dioceses : because *Bishops were made for the Church, and not the Church for Bishops* (e); because the Right of a particular Diocesan to the Subjection of his People, was given him by the Church for her Benefit, and therefore ceases, when it would turn to her Ruin.

Object. 5. Is not a Bishop then wronged, who is deprived by Incompetent Powers?

Answ. Yes; by those who deprive him, but not by the Church or his People, who thereupon desert him and submit to another Bishop in his room : any more than a Civil Prince is wronged by a City of his, which happens to be taken by Force, and thereupon swears Allegiance to the Conqueror. And tho' commonly such Citizens might, if they pleas'd, follow their old Master; yet since they cannot stay and enjoy the Privileges of the City, without submitting to the Conqueror, such a Submission is not esteem'd any Contempt of or Undutifulness to their old Master.

(e) Quod Christiani sumus, propter nos est : quod autem Episcopi sumus, propter vos est. In eo quod Christiani sumus, attenditur utilitas nostra, in eo quod Praepositi, non nisi vestra. Augustin. *Lib. di Pastoribus.* c. 1. Conf. 1 Cor. 3. 21, 22.

Object.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 203

Object. 6. This is contrary to the Practice of the Church; which always adhered to Bishops Deprived or Banished wrongfully by Heretical or Heathen Princes.

Answer. She adhered to them, not out of regard to their Persons, but to their Orthodoxy, and because the Prince Deprived them for the same reason, for which he would have Deprived any other Bishops whom she should have Constituted in their room; and so if she had constituted other Bishops, it would have been to no purpose, but to have exposed them to be persecuted and ejected like their Predecessors. But when an Heretical Prince has Deprived a Bishop for his Orthodoxy, and happen'd by Mistake to place another Orthodox Bishop in his room, those of the Church who believed the new Bishop to be Orthodox, submitted to him; as I have shewn from several Instances.



SECT.



S E C T. IV.

That if we should suppose, that the new Bishops were wrongfully put in the Place of the Deprived Bishops; and that consequently it was Lawful to separate from the Communion of the new Bishops and their Adherents, during the Lives of the Deprived Bishops; yet it would cease to be lawful to separate now, when the Deprived Bishops are all dead.

DURING the Lives of the Deprived Bishops, there was some Pretence, tho' the weakest sure that ever was, for dividing; but now they are deceased, there is no Colour left. Their Right, if they had any, is extinguish'd with themselves, and thereby the ground of the Schism, and consequently the Schism it self, is taken away. The Bishops in possession are true Bishops, and have a Right to their Dioceses, and no one else has. And therefore our Adversaries are now utterly

utterly inexcusable for not submitting to our Bishops.

“ When the Cause is intirely removed,
 “ its Effect which depends upon it, must
 “ also be taken away. Thus the Cause
 “ of a Man’s being a Heretick is his re-
 “ ceiving an Heretical Doctrine; and
 “ therefore when he ceases to maintain
 “ that Doctrine, he ceases to be a Here-
 “ tick; as it is asserted in the 14th An-
 “ swer *ad Orthodoxos*, which Dr. *Hicker*
 “ quotes with Approbation (a). In case
 “ of a Heretick’s becoming Orthodox, the
 “ Default of his Heresy is rectify’d by the
 “ Change of his Opinion (b). So when
 “ *Paulus Samosatenus* Bishop of *Antioch*,
 “ had asserted, that Christ was a mere
 “ Man, and had promised the first Sy-
 “ nod of Bishops which assembled on
 “ that Account, that he would change his
 “ Sentiments, *They did not pronounce Sentence*
 “ *against him, because they hoped, that upon*
 “ *his performing his Promise, all would have*
 “ *been well again.* Now according to the

(a) P. 208.

(b) Τὸ αἰρετικὸν ὅτι τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἐρχόμενος τὸ σφάλμα διορθῆται, τῆς μὲν κακοδοξίας, τῇ μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου φρονήματι. (c) Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 30.

Firmilian, the leading Bishop in that Council, condemn’d the Doctrine, ἐπαγγελαμένον ὃ (παύλος) μεταθήσεσθαι πιστεύσας καὶ ἐλπίσας, ἀνευ πυνθῆσαι τὸν λόγον λοιδορίας, τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰς διόν καταστήσεσθαι, ἀνεβάλλετο.

“ Prin-

“ Principles of our Adversaries, *Paulus*
 “ *Samosatenus* by maintaining this Heresy,
 “ ceased to be rightful Bishop of *Anti-*
 “ *och*; yet if he had forborn to maintaint
 “ this Heresy, he would, in the Opinion
 “ of that Synod, have become again
 “ rightful and regular Bishop of *Antioch*.
 “ And for the same reason, if he had
 “ before their assembling, changed his O-
 “ pinion, he would have become rightful
 “ Bishop without their concerning them-
 “ selves. And in like manner Dr. *Hickes*
 “ expressly owns (d), that both the Schism
 “ and the Rebellion will have an end, when
 “ God is pleased to remove the Causes of
 “ them.

“ The only thing then in Dispute is;
 “ whether the Cause of the Schism, where-
 “ with our Adversaries charge us, be re-
 “ moved or no. Now they judg'd some
 “ of our Bishops to be principal Schisma-
 “ ticks, because of their intruding into
 “ the Dioces of the Deprived Bishops;
 “ and others of us to be Schismatics by
 “ Contagion, because we communicated
 “ with such principal Schismatics; and
 “ on that account they forsook our Com-

(d) P. 218.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 207

“munion (e). The Cause then of our
“pretended principal Schism, was the op-
“posing of the Diocesan Authority of
“those particular Persons who were
“Deprived. Those Persons are all dead,
“and our opposition to them is at an end;
“and consequently our principal Schism,
“supposed to be caused by that oppo-
“sition, must be at an end also. And
“where there is no principal Schism;
“there can be no Schism by Contagion.
“For no one can be a Schismatick by
“communicating with principal Schis-
“maticks, when there are no principal
“Schismaticks to be communicated with.
“And therefore as, in the Opinion of
“our Adversaries, we ceased to be Mem-
“bers of the Church, because we re-
“jected those rightful Diocesans: So if
“they will be consistent with themselves
“they must own, that we are become
“Members of the Church again, because
“we do not now reject those or indeed
“any rightful Diocesans.
“If we had not Deprived the Non-
“juring Bishops, but extirpated Episco-
“pacy, or in the room of the Deprived
“Bishops, had placed such Bishops as

(e) We date the Schism from the Consecrations of the
Usurping Bishops. *Dr. Hicke*, p. 39.

“ had

“ had no Episcopal Consecration, but were
 “ only constituted by the Lay Power :
 “ Then indeed the Schism would have
 “ continued, because the principal Cause
 “ would have still subsisted, *viz.* our
 “ opposition to Bishops in general ; but
 “ we are as zealous for Episcopacy as our
 “ Adversaries, and our Bishops were
 “ consecrated in the very same Man-
 “ ner, that the Deprived ones were.

“ So that the only pretended Crimes sup-
 “ posed to have made us Schismatics, were
 “ Personal Injuries to the Deprived Bishops.
 “ Those Bishops are all Dead, and there-
 “ fore the Personal Injuries offered to
 “ them are extinguished with them.
 “ For all Personal Rights are extinguish-
 “ ed by Death, particularly the Right
 “ of a Bishop manifestly is so, being gi-
 “ ven him only for his Life. And they
 “ who possess no Right, are not capable
 “ of being wrong’d. Nor are they ca-
 “ pable of a Reparation of their past In-
 “ juries. For if their Adversaries were
 “ willing to restore, they are now in-
 “ capable of receiving, what was taken
 “ from them. And much less are they
 “ capable of demanding Satisfaction ; not
 “ only because they are not capable of
 “ receiving it, but because they, who
 “ have no Right to any Thing, can-
 “ not

not have a Right to demand Satisfaction. Nor can any demand Satisfaction in their Name. For they who demand in another's Name, demand in his Right: And therefore they cannot demand in the Name of one, who has no Right. And as it thus appears from the Reason of the Thing, that all Rights and Injuries must be extinguished with the Person who was the Subject of them; so it is necessary for the Peace of Mankind, that it should be so. For if Claims on Account of Personal Injuries might justly be perpetuated, this must ruin all Society; because Men would have so many Claims on one another on Account of their Ancestors as well as themselves. " Since then, the Injuries supposed to be offered to the Deprived Bishops being Personal, are perfectly expired with their Persons; what Injuries can our Adversaries now complain of with relation to the Deprived Bishops which may justify their Separation? Is their Diocesan Right devolved on any living Persons, who are kept out of that Right in the same Manner that they were? No. Right may devolve in an Hereditary Succession, but not in an Elective one, as is that of Diocesans.

“ In such a Succession none can pretend
 “ to an actual Right, till he is chosen
 “ by the Consent of those, who have a
 “ Canonical Right to chuse him. Now
 “ our Adversaries, as I shall observe
 “ hereafter, neither were, nor could be
 “ chosen, nor do they pretend to it.

“ Did they Substitute Bishops to Act
 “ after their Decease in the Right they
 “ once had of Diocesans? That was
 “ beyond their Power. Because for
 “ a Diocesan to Substitute his Suc-
 “ cessor in his Diocese is Usurpation,
 “ Diocesans having only a Right for their
 “ own Lives. And therefore *Paulinus* is
 “ said to have transgressed the Canons,
 “ in consecrating *Evagrius* for his Suc-
 “ cessor in his life time (f)

“ Did they bequeath to others the
 “ Right they claimed of acting out of
 “ their own Dioceses, and of acting in
 “ the Name of the Church of *England*,
 “ and of concluding all the Dioceses in
 “ *England*? That supposed Right they
 “ could not bequeath. For it was ground-
 “ ed on the pretence that any Bishop
 “ may act in a vacant Diocese, where

(f) Theodorit. H. E. L. 5. c. 23.

no one can be injured by his acting;
 and that all Dioceses but those of the
 Deprived Bishops were vacant, because
 the possessing Bishops and Clergy were
 Schismaticks by Contagion, and Schis-
 maticks cannot fill Dioceses. But now
 the pretended Vacancy of those Dio-
 ceses, and the Right the Deprived Bi-
 shops claimed of acting in those Dio-
 ceses on account of that Vacancy, are
 extinguished with the Schism which
 caused them; and an extinguished Right
 cannot be transferred to other Bishops.
 Besides, since the Deprived Bishops could
 not give others such an Authority to act
 in their *own* Dioceses, as was to com-
 mence after their decease; much less
 could they give the like Authority to act
 in Dioceses which were *not their*
own.

And as it appears, that the Injuries
 alledged to be offered to the Deprived
 Bishops, and our Schism said to be
 caused by those Injuries, must expire
 with those Bishops: So it is plain
 from another Consideration, that both
 the Schism and the Injuries did expire
 sooner. Personal Injuries end either
 with the Death of the Persons injured,
 or by their receiving, or giving up their
 Right to, Satisfaction. Now suppo-

212 A TREATISE *against the*

“ sing Bishop *Ken* to have been invalid-
 “ ly Deprived; yet he, if we may rely on
 “ Dr. *Hickes*’s Authority (g), resigned
 “ his Diocese to the present Bishop of
 “ *Bath and Wells*; and thereby not on-
 “ ly put a stop to the Continuance of
 “ the Injuries pretended to be offered
 “ him, but gave up all Claim to Satis-
 “ faction for past Injuries, because he
 “ divested himself of that Quality, which
 “ alone could give him a Right to demand
 “ the Satisfaction our Adversaries contend
 “ for; and because, as Dr. *Hickes* tells us,
 “ (h) he resigned on purpose to heal the
 “ Schism in his Diocese: Which could not
 “ be healed, while he claimed Satis-
 “ faction.

“ But we are told (i), that it was not
 “ in his Power to make the Cession without
 “ the Consent of this Collegues. If so, no
 “ Cession of his could be valid, while
 “ his Collegues lived; but he must have
 “ continued till their Death, as rightful
 “ Bishop, as he was before such pretend-
 “ ed Cession. And consequently, if it
 “ were possible, that upon their Death

(g) P. 228.

(h) P. 227.

(i) *Ibid.*

“ their

“ their Right should devolve, as our Ad-
“ versaries pretend it did (*k*), it must
“ have devolved to him the Survivor (*l*).
“ If they had a Right to conclude all
“ the Dioces of *England*, and to act in
“ the Name of the Church of *England*,
“ he being the only Survivor must have
“ that Right singly in himself. And
“ therefore if any one were then Injured,
“ it must be he alone; if any one had
“ a Right to demand Reparation of his
“ Injuries, or of the past Injuries of his
“ Predecessors, or to require Satisfaction
“ for the Mischief done to the Church
“ by interrupting her Succession, it must
“ be he alone. And if he alone had
“ the Power of demanding Satisfacti-
“ on, he alone had the Power of re-
“ mitting it. And if he could remit it,
“ he did; for when he was the only
“ Survivor of the Deprived Bishops, af-
“ ter the Death of the Deprived Bi-
“ shop of *Norwich*, he did, to use Mr.

(*k*) *Dr. Benner's Concessions destructive to his Cause*,
p. 37, 38. Bishop *Lloyd* acted as a Bishop in all the
Sees, and when he died, *Dr. Hickes* had the same Right
of Superintendency. (*l*) For according to the Prin-

ciples of our Adversaries, it is manifest, that upon Bi-
shop *Lloyd's* Death, the Superintendency must be in
Bishop *Ken*, before it could descend to *Dr. Hickes*.

“ *Dodwel’s Words (m), own, ratify and no-*
 “ *tify that Surrendry of his Diocese to the*
 “ *present Bishop thereof, which he had*
 “ *made before. And he manifestly need-*
 “ *ed the Consent of none to make this*
 “ *his Surrendry valid, because the De-*
 “ *prived Archbishop and all his Colle-*
 “ *gues were dead, and Bishop Ken was*
 “ *the only rightful Diocesan.*

“ For the same Reasons, if we should
 “ suppose the Church of *Ireland* to have
 “ been guilty of Schism, that Schism
 “ must be extinguished, not only because
 “ the Bishop of *Kimore*, the only Bishop
 “ Deprived there, is dead: but because,
 “ when he was desired by the *English*
 “ Nonjuring Nonconformists, to take the
 “ *Pastoral Care of them, and be a Prin-*
 “ *ciple of Unity to them*, he refused it (n);
 “ which makes it probable, that he had
 “ then for the sake of Peace derelinquish-
 “ ed his Claim to his own Diocese; at
 “ least, it is plain, that he did not think
 “ it proper, that the Claims of our De-
 “ prived Bishops, and the Schism there-
 “ by occasioned, should survive them;
 “ And consequently that he did not de-

(m) *Case in Fact*, p. 6.
 P. 174.

(n) *V. Dr. Hickes*,

“ sign, that his own Claim, or any Divi-
“ sion on his Account, should be con-
“ tinued beyond his Life.

By such Arguments as these Mr. *Dod-
mel* proves; that the supposed Schism is
perfectly ended. Our present Bishops
also, which is the next thing I am to shew,
are true Bishops. For they were conse-
crated according to the common Forms,
and are therefore true Bishops. Nay sup-
posing them to have been, as our Adver-
saries falsely pretend, consecrated by Schis-
matical Bishops; yet their Orders are good.
For as Sacraments, so Orders confer'd by
Schismatical Bishops, are valid; because
Bishops upon falling into Schism, do not
lose their own Orders. For at Ordina-
tion, as I before observed, Christ gives a
Command, and the Person ordain'd co-
venants to discharge sacred Functions in
a lawful Manner, and upon lawful Oc-
casions. Now a Clergyman by Heresy,
Schism, or any other gross Wickedness,
forfeits the chief Privileges and Advan-
tages which would accrue to himself from
his Orders: but he cannot by those Crimes
dissolve his own Covenant, and set him-
self loose from Christ's Command. And
as for this Reason he cannot extinguish
his Orders by his own Act; so for the like
Reason no one can take them away from
him,

him, any more than they can his Baptism. For since Orders convey a direct Command of Christ, no one can release Men from this Command, but Christ who imposed it, or Persons authorized by Christ. Now Christ and his Apostles gave Commandments to ordain, and Instructions how to do it; but they never gave any Command or Directions to take away Orders. So that the Church does not by Degradation, as some mistake, properly take away Orders, but inhibits a Clergyman to execute his Orders; and this Inhibition of hers extends throughout the universal Church; wherein it differs from the Deprivation of a Temporal Prince, which extends no farther than his own Dominions.

A Bishop then who turns Schismatick, retains a Command or Commission to execute Episcopal Functions: And therefore, if he does any Episcopal Acts, they will be valid; I mean such Acts, as he does in the Name of God, whose Commission he bears. For a Clergyman is to be consider'd in a double Respect, as he acts in the Name of God, and as he represents the Congregation. When Prayers, and Praises are offered up to God by him as the Mouth of the Congregation, if he be an open Heretick or Schismatick, there

there is no reason to expect that his Prayers should be effectual, because his Congregation sin, by joyning in Communion with him: And when Persons sin in the very Act of Offering up their Prayers, the Prayers of such Wicked must undoubtedly be an Abomination. But when a Bishop acts in the Name of God, the Validity of what he does, does not depend upon his own Vertue, but his Commission; and how faulty soever he may be in other respects, while his Commission is good, his Acts in pursuance of it will be good too (o). Now a Bishop in Ordaining, acts in Christ's Name, and Ministerially conveys his Command or Commission to other Men. And provided a Commission be really the King's, and the Messenger who brings it to a Man, were order'd to do so; it is not *essential*, whether the Messenger be a good or a bad Man, an *Englishman* or a Foreigner. Yet tho' it be not *essential* to the Validity of Orders, whether they be confer'd by Schismatical or Catholick Bishops, I confess, there is a great difference. For notwithstanding that a Schismatical Bishop in ordaining, effectually conveys sacred Com-

(o) Comp. the 26th Article of the Church of *England*.

missions to Men ; yet they do not therewith receive those internal Graces which ordinarily accompany that Ordinance : because by communicating with a known Schismatick, they obstruct the Entrance of the Spirit, as the Wicked do by their Impenitency, when they receive the Sacrament of Baptism.

It may seem strange perhaps, that one who is a Schismatick or Heretick, and out of the Church, should convey to one who is in the same Circumstances, a Church Office, especially when they both design thereby to promote the Schism or Heresy.

To which I answer, that the professed Design of Schismaticks is to confer and receive Holy Orders : but if with this Design there be mixed a secret Intention to promote their Schism, their Case seems to be the same with that of those Persons, who admit others, or are themselves admitted into Holy Orders, with a private ambitious Design, thereby to raise their own Fortunes, or compass some other Temporal End. The Men act unlawfully, but the Ordination is nevertheless valid ; it being not material to the Essence of Ordination, what either the Person Ordaining or Ordained secretly intends, but what is intended and appointed

ed by God. As when the King sends a Commission, the Commission is good, and the Person who receives it, is bound to answer the Purport of it and the Intent of his King, whatever he or the Messenger may intend thereby.

And as to Hereticks and Schismatics being out of the Church, it is true, that they are shut out of the Benefits and Privileges thereof: but they are not so entirely out of the Church, as to be in no sense Members of it; they are still Subjects of the Church, but seditious and rebellious ones; they belong to the Sheepfold, tho' they be strayed from it. This appears, because upon their Repentance they are restored to the Church, without being Rebaptized. And it cannot be pretended that they had lost their Baptism, and that the Act of the Church in receiving them, restored them to the Condition they were in before: For no Act of the Church can be of equal Virtue with a Sacrament. It is agreed, that those who are converted and baptized by Hereticks, are not to be Rebaptized: But how can they, by being afterward admitted among Catholics, as baptized, be said to be put in the Condition they were in before, if their Baptism having been administered by Hereticks had been null?

Besides,

Besides, at Baptism a Man is commanded, and covenants to obey Christ. And this is an Obligation which he cannot dissolve by his own Fault; and therefore, tho' he should become Schismatick or Heretick, he will still be under a formal and immediate Obligation to obey Christ. And he who is bound to obey Christ is his Subject, and consequently capable of being made his Officer: And if a Commission be convey'd to him, and he accepts of it, it will be valid.

It may also be objected, that the Act of a Bishop in Ordaining is only valid, because Christ has commissioned him to ordain; and that Christ has prohibited Schismatical Bishops to ordain. To which I answer; So Christ has prohibited a Bishop to lay Hands suddenly on any Man in Ordination, or to ordain when he is thinking on worldly Affairs: yet if a Bishop should transgress these Prohibitions, his Ordaining would be valid. Christ has prohibited Hereticks and Schismatics to baptize; yet Baptism administred by them is not to be renew'd. The whole of this Matter is; a Bishop receives from Christ a Commission to ordain, and a Prohibition to ordain, when he himself or the Person ordain'd, is not duly qualify'd for that Act. The Commission
re-

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 221

relates to the Essentials, and the Prohibition to the Circumstances of Ordination. It is Essential to Ordination, that it should be perform'd by one commission'd to ordain, and with the Apostolical Form, *viz.* Imposition of Hands. But if the Ordination be right, as to Substance, it will be valid, tho' it should be perform'd unlawfully, as to Circumstances.

And all this appears to have been the Sense of the Christian Church. For the Council of *Nice* received the *Novatian* (p) and *Meletian* (q) Clergy; and the Council of *Carthage* received the *Donatist* Clergy (r), without Reordaining them. And before the Council of *Carthage*, first Pope *Melchisedes* (s), and then all the Catholick Bishops of *Africa* (t) were ready to have received the *Donatists* upon the same Terms. Nay, the Church has treated even Heretical Bishops in the same manner. For the *Alexandrian* Council received the *Arian* Clergy without Reordaining them (u). And there is a more early Instance, wherein she declared it to

(p) *Can. 8.*
crat. L. 1. C. 9.
gustini, Ep. 2. 162.

(q) *See their Synodical Epistle, So-*
(r) Can. 71.
(s) V. Au-
(t) Collat. Carthag. 1. di-

c. 16. Nec honorem Episcopatus amittant. Neque enim
in eis Divinæ Sacramenta veritatis, sed Commenta hu-
mani detestamur Erroris.
(u) V. Baronium ad An-
num 362.

be her Sentiment, that Bishops by turning Hereticks do not extinguish their Orders. About the middle of the third Century *Paulus Samosatenus*, as I before observed, after having been convicted of Heresy (*w*), was upon promising to renounce it, suffered to continue in his See, by *Firmilian* and the other Bishops of the Council assembled at *Antioch* on his account; and that without Reordination. For they did not proceed so far as formally to condemn him. Now if those Primitive Bishops had thought, that by propagating Heresy he had lost his Orders and all his Episcopal Character, they would never have consented, that he should have remained in one of the most considerable Bishopricks then in the World, without being ordain'd again. And farther, even the *Romanists* did not pretend to reordain those, who had been ordain'd by Protestant Bishops in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time; nor do they at present reordain those Priests who come over to them from the *Greek Church*, tho' they esteem that Church, as well as ours, to be guilty not

(*w*) For *Firmilian* condemned the Doctrine as Heretical, and *Paulus* plainly confessed his having maintained it, by promising to Change. *V. supra*, p. 105.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 223

only of Schism but of Heresy (x). And our own Church also does to this Day admit the Priests of the Church of *Rome*, which we esteem to be at least Schismatical, without reordaining them.

Now the Church by thus receiving Schismatical Clergymen, demonstrates that she esteems their Orders good: Because she never did, without Reordaining, receive those as Clergymen, whom she did not judge validly ordained. And consequently she esteems Orders conferred by Schismatical Bishops to be valid. For those Schismatical Clergymen, whom I have mentioned to have been received by her, were not only such, as had been ordained by Catholics, and afterward turned Schismaticks, but chiefly such, as had been ordained by Schismatical Bishops. For Instance, the *Donatist* Clergy received by the Council of *Carthage* had been ordained, nay and born too in the Schism; For at the time of that Council the Schism had lasted about 100 Years (y); which shews, that it was not the Opinion of the Church that Bi-

(x) See Bishop *Burnet's* H. of the Ref. Vol. 2 p. 289, 290.

(y) For according to *Baronius*, that Council was held anno 401, and *Majorinus* was chosen in opposition to *Cacilianus* anno 306.

bishops upon turning Schismatics lost their Orders, and that she by receiving them upon their Repentance restored their Orders, to that Validity which they had before: But that Bishops retain their Orders, after and while they are Schismatics. For if the *Donatist* Bishops had lost their own Orders, they would have been really Laymen, and the Orders conferred by them would have been esteemed null, and the Persons ordained by them would not have been received by the Church without Reordination.

Upon the whole then it appears from Reason, and is confirmed by the Practice of the Church, that Orders conferred by Schismatical Bishops are valid; and this Point is so clear that our Adversaries themselves sometimes allow it (z). And consequently our present Bishops are true Bishops, tho' we should suppose them to have been consecrated by Schismatical Bishops.

And as they are true Bishops so they have a good Title to the Dioceses which

(z) Mr. Kettlewell's *Christian Communion*, part 3. Ch. 6. p. 69. *Historical Collections*, p. 167, 177. Excerpts by the same Author, p. 173, 174. The Preface to Dr. Hicke's, p. 14, 15. And Dr. Hicke's himself seems to allow it, p. 207, 208, 211. but seems to deny it. p. 270, 314, 315.

they possess. To make this the more manifest, I shall in the first Place shew negatively, that no one else has a Title to their Dioceses. Our Adversaries contend, that the pretended Nonjuring Bishops have the only Right to exercise the Episcopal Office in this Church. But it is incumbent upon them to shew previously, that those Persons, if any such be now living, are in any Sense true and real Bishops. For their Consecrations were performed in secret, in secret I mean, not only as to us, but as to the *Nonconforming* Nonjurors themselves. Many principal Persons among them, as well as their common People, did not for a considerable Time so much as know, that there had been any such Consecrations. It is notorious, that even Mr. *Dodwel* and Mr. *Nelson* were for many Years ignorant of them: And Dr. *Hickes* acquaints us, that *some of their Brethren left them, because the Bishop of Kilmore refused to take the Pastoral Care of them, as a Catholick Bishop* (a): Which shews, that they did not know of any other Catholick Nonjuring Bishop, who could discharge that Office. The Dr.

(a) P. 174.

also informs us (b), that *some considerable Persons of their Communion told the late Bishop Ken, they were afraid no Provision was made for the Church, and that he assured them, Provision was made by new Consecrations*: Which implies, that the Performance of those Consecrations had been a Secret to them. And the Dr. in another Place (c) plainly owns *their Clandestine Consecrations*, and attempts to justify them, and asks, *whether the Notification of their Consecrations to their Faithful Presbyters, and their Laity, when and as there is Occasion, is not a sufficient Notification in such a dangerous State of Persecution?* From whence we learn, that those Consecrations were at first concealed from their Presbyters, as well as their Laity.

Now the Church of *England*, of which our Adversaries pretend to be the only true Members, does not instruct us (d) to acknowledge any Persons to have Authority to call and send Ministers, nor consequently to acknowledge any Persons to have Episcopal Authority, but those *who have publick Authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send*

(b) P. 227.
Article.

(c) P. 220.

(d) See her 23d

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 227

Ministers. And St. Cyprian in a Synodical Epistle (e) delivers it as a general Rule of the Church received from Apostolical Practice, *that Bishops ought to be Consecrated in the publick Congregation.* And even one of our Adversaries (f) arguing, *that the Succession of Bishops has not been interrupted; and that there have not been Sham Consecrations,* has these Words, “ Forged
“ Pretences to Ordination could not affect
“ the Bishops, *their Consecrations were al-*
“ *ways Publick,* and guarded with so
“ much Care, that I defy you to prove
“ even the possibility of such a Cheat.

Dr. Hickes indeed pleads (g) that the *Nonconforming* Nonjurors are not now bound to observe this Rule, because they are in a State of Persecution. But the Fathers, whom our Adversaries pretend to follow, would not admit of Clandestine Consecrations on account of any Necessity or Persecution: For Instance, when *Fabian* Bishop of *Rome* suffered Martyrdom in *Decius's* Persecution (h), the Church did not immediately constitute him a Successor, because of the Difficulties of the

(e) Viz. 67. (f) Viz. Mr. Earbery, *old English Constitution Vindic.* p. 93. (g) P. 220. (h) V. Euseb. H. E. L. 6. c. 39.

times (i); but after the See had been vacant for a Year and some Months, it was thought fit to delay no longer, and *Cornelius* was made Bishop, and that in no Clandestine Manner, but by many other Bishops, and in the Presence of the Clergy and People (k). This was done while the Persecution still continued very hot (l); and the doing it in this publick Manner exposed *Cornelius* to the imminent hazard of being slain with the Sword, or crucified, or burned with Fire, or torn Limb from Limb: For St. *Cyprian* informs us, that would certainly have been his Lot, if God's Providence had not protected him. Now there would have been no need to have delay'd so long to constitute a Bishop of *Rome*, when that Church was in great want of one (m): Nor would there have been any Occasion that *Cornelius* and indeed all other Bishops should have been,

(i) *Cypriani Epist.* 30. Nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates Constitutus.

(k) De Clericorum pæne omnium testimonio, de Plebis quæ tunc affuit suffragio. *Idem Ep.* 55.

(l) Sedisse intrepidum (*Cornelium*) *Rome* eo tempore, quo Tyrannus (*Decius*) infestus Sacerdotibus Dei fanda atque infanda comminaretur, &c. *Ibid.*

(m) This appears from the Epistle of the *Roman* Presbyters and Deacons to St. *Cyprian*. *Cypriani Ep.* 30.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 229

as they then were, the first and surest to suffer Martyrdom; but they might often have been in no more danger than any private Christians; if they could have allowed themselves to have used this Expedient of Clandestine Consecrations.

But this was so far from being their Practice, that I do not know one Instance of it. Dr. *Hickes* produces the before-mentioned Example of *Eusebius* of *Samojata*. But tho' his Ordinations were Clandestine as to Hereticks and the Enemies of the Christian Faith, yet it by no Means appears, that they were concealed from the Orthodox themselves, but rather the contrary. For it is said, that *he set Bishops over the Churches which wanted them*: which how he could do, and the Churches not know of it, will be difficult for any, but our Adversaries, to conceive.

I have shewn indeed, that the Fear of Persecution and the Necessity of the Times will excuse the Observation of any Rules relating to the Circumstances of Religion: Yet it will not justify the neglect of such Rules, as are *essential* to Religion; whereof this seems to be one, that Bishops should be publickly consecrated: because Bishops, as our Adversaries agree, are essential to the Christian

Q 3

Re-

Religion; and the Observation of this Rule seems, from the Nature of the Thing, to be essential to give Bishops Episcopal Authority. For in order to that it seems essential, that the People should have a Moral Assurance, that the Person who claims Authority over them, claims it justly, and that they may safely depend upon the Validity of his Ministrations. And I do not see, how it is possible for them to have such Assurance in the Case of such clandestine Consecrations, as the pretended ones of our Adversaries.

The Papists indeed object to us, that Archbishop *Parker* was clandestinely consecrated at the *Nags-Head Tavern* in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign. But we have no Reason to be moved with that Fable, not only because it was confuted by the Records, and by a living Witness of his having been publicly consecrated: but because it was notorious, that it was generally said at the Beginning of that Reign, that such a Consecration had been regularly performed; that Archbishop *Parker* did from that Time, in virtue of it, act as Archbishop; that it was as much the Interest of the Papists to question the Regularity of this Consecration at first as afterward; and yet that it was not then questioned, nor
this

this Fable started till 40 Years after, when the Papists in all probability thought, that all Living Witnesses of that Affair were dead (n). But if that Consecration had been perform'd in secret; if it had been conceal'd from Protestants as well Papists; if there had been at first no publick Discourse, that such a particular Person had been consecrated, nor so much as that any Consecration had been performed; if no publick Acts had been done in virtue of that Consecration; if it had been thus concealed for many Years, and till the Consecrators were all dead: If upon the first Report, that there had been such a Consecration, the Truth of it had been question'd, and yet no publick Proof had been made of it; if on the contrary, several Protestants had been knowingly suffer'd to be perverted to Popery, for want of such Proof: If all this had happen'd, I do not see how the Protestants could have confuted that Calumny, or have made out that there had been really such a Consecration, or have given any reasonable Satisfaction to their People, that they had any true Bishops among them. For tho'

(n) Bishop *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, Vol. II.
p. 403.

we should have produced Instruments of Consecration, yet since those Instruments had been so long hid, and no publick Recourse could be had to them; since we had refused to prove the Matter to our own Friends, tho' we had been often called upon to do it, it would have given great ground to have suspected the Instruments to have been forged.

But should we suppose these pretended Bishops to have been validly consecrated; yet it seems certain, that they have since their Consecration renounced and made a Cession of their Episcopal Authority, by never publicly claiming nor exercising it.

They are pretended to have been consecrated as early as 1694 or 1695 (o): And they carefully concealed their Consecration from their own People till the late Bishop *Lloyd* died, which was about 1709. Now I believe it to be impossible to produce any Instance before this, of a Number of Bishops, whether Suffragans or Diocesans, who kept themselves *incognito* for 15 Years. Upon Bishop *Lloyd's*

(o) This appears from the Exemplification of Mr. *Howel's* pretended Priest's Orders; printed in the *Courant* of September 17. 1716.

Death and the Resignation of Bishop *Ken*, the Thinking People among the *Nonconforming* Nonjurors, (who had a strict Right to be informed) begun to examine whether the Schism were not at an end; whether there were any more Bishops in opposition to our Bishops, to whom they ought to adhere; or whether they were not under a Necessity of returning to the Church of *England*, unless they would sit down without a Ministry or Sacraments. Then certainly, if ever, was not only a proper but a necessary Occasion for them publicly to notify their Consecrations to their Presbyters and Laity, in order to have preserved their People from joining our Church, if they really judged her to be Schismatical.

But they still declined to own themselves. Mr. *Dodwel* and Mr. *Nelson* seem not, for some Time after Bishop *Lloyd's* Death, to have known that they had any such Bishops; and probably they never knew, who those Bishops were. Several others of the most considerable among them, apply'd expressly to know, whether they had any Bishops, with whom they might communicate; and not being able to receive Satisfaction, did for that very Reason forsake them. And Dr. *Hickes* himself thus acquaints us, "Some of our
" few

“ few deserting Brethren thought the
 “ Bishop of *Kilmore*, as a Catholick Bi-
 “ shop, qualify’d to keep up our Com-
 “ munion; and would not have left us,
 “ if he would have taken the Pastoral
 “ Care of us. So that these Men left our
 Adversaries, not only because our Adver-
 saries had no Diocesans, but because these
 Men did not know of any Catholick Bi-
 shops they had among them. And Dr.
Hickes himself appears to have known,
 that they left them for that Reason; and
 yet he did not satisfy them, that they had
 any such Bishops.

And by the way, I infer from hence,
 either that Dr. *Hickes* did not then think
 our Communion Schismatical, or that he
 had not that Zeal for the Souls of Men
 in his Heart, which he makes Profession
 of in his Writings; or that since Bishop
Lloyd’s Death, he changed the Opinion
 which he entertained of these Matters at
 the Time of his Death, after he had been
 considering them above twenty Years:
 Which must argue great Levity and Un-
 settledness, or else that his Judgment was
 impaired with his Age.

To proceed; those pretended Bishops
 did not also for a long Time, exercise their
 Offices in any *publick* manner; *publick*, I
 mean, as to their own People; and there-
 fore

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 235

fore they did, according to the Principles of our Adversaries themselves, make a valid Cession of it, tho' they should have claimed it Formally and in Words. For, as our Adversaries upon other Occasions contend, *a Protestation against Fact is of no force.* *Narcissus* Bishop of *Jerusalem* withdrew from thence, and that Church not knowing what was become of him, a new Bishop was constituted in his room (*p*). Now the Congregation of the Nonjuring Nonconformists, for a long Time after the Death of Bishop of *Lloyd*, knew no more of their pretended Bishops, than the Church of *Jerusalem* did of *Narcissus*: and it may be questioned, whether they ever knew any thing certainly of Dr. *Hickes's* being a Bishop, till he died, or will ever know any thing of the other pretended Bishops, till they shall happen to die also. If therefore the Retreat of *Narcissus* were justly construed for a Cession, which no one ever yet questioned: the long and obstinate Refusal of these pretended Bishops to own and exercise their Office, must be a clearer and stronger Renunciation; since some of them themselves have been asked, whether there were any such Bi-

(*p*) *V. Euseb. H. E. L. 6. c. 9, 10.*

shops,

shops, and since there has been a Necessity of declaring themselves, if they designed to have a Right to exercise their Office, and if they judged us to continue Schismatical after the Decease of the Deprived Bishops.

But supposing, both that those pretended Bishops are true Bishops, and that they had claimed and exercised their Office; Yet it is still plain, that they have no Right to *English* Dioceses. For Dr. *Hickes* himself acquaints us, in one place (q) that they are *not Diocesans, but Suffragans and Catholick Bishops*; and in another place (r), that our Bishops are *Intruders not into full but vacant Sees, that they are Usurpers of what is not theirs, tho' not of what is anothers.*

And as by their own Confession they are not Diocesans: So they never could be; nor ever can be in the present Circumstances of Affairs. The Nonjuring Bishops after their Deprivation could not pretend a Right to their Dioceses on any other Account, but their having been nominated by the King, elected by the respective Deans and Chapters, confirm-

(q) P. 173.

(r) P. 205.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 237

ed by the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and afterward possessed of those Dioceses. Now since their Decease no other Nonjuror can have this pretence.

No one can pretend to be elected by the Dean and Chapter of the Diocese. Now they are by our Constitution the standing Electors of Bishops: And since our whole Clergy do either in Person, or by their Representatives in Convocation, assent to all Canons; and both Clergy and Laity by their Representatives in Parliament, assent to all Statutes, and consequently what is agreeable to our Constitution, is consented to by the Members of our Church: Deans and Chapters, being appointed Electors of Bishops by our Constitution, may well be understood to represent all those, who can have any Right to elect. He then who is capitularly, is duly elected. And he who cannot be elected by the Dean and Chapter, the Representatives of the Diocese, and much less by the whole Clergy and People collectively, can never be duly elected.

No Nonjuror can be confirmed by the Archbishop of *Canterbury* or *York*; because they confess that they have no such Archbishop, in owning that they have no Diocesans. Nor can they now obtain

tain such Archbishops for the same Reasons, that they cannot have Diocesan Bishops.

The Possession of a Diocese, and the Personal and Immediate Submission of the Members of it, is the strongest Confirmation of a Bishop's precedent Election; and this is also what no Nonjurors ever had, or can have, as Things now stand.

All then, which any Nonjuror can do to obtain a Pretence to a Diocese, must be, to get the Pretender to Nominate him. And if the Pretender should do so, this alone would not give him a Right, tho' we should suppose the Pretender to be a Rightful Prince. For no one can Rightfully be a Bishop of any *English* Diocese, upon the bare Nomination of the King, till he is also Elected by the Dean and Chapter, and Confirmed by one of our Archbishops. And Dr. *Hickes* himself tells us (f), that *Obedience neither is, nor can be due to Bishops, who overthwart the local Customs and Constitutions of the Places, where they pretend to be Bishops.*

(f) P. 200. And in the same Page he quotes the following Assertion of *Léo the First*, Bishop of Rome. *Nulla ratio finit, ut inter Episcopos habeantur, qui nec a Clericis sunt Electi, nec a Plebe expetiti, &c.*

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 239

Now since it appears, that the pretended Nonjuring Bishops neither have, nor can have a Right to *English* Dioceses: it will be the more easily proved, that our Bishops have a Right to them. And indeed they have the very same Right, which the Deprived Bishops had to their Dioceses before their Deprivation.

They were Nominated by the King ; they were Elected by the usual Electors ; and they were received and submitted to by their respective Dioceses, according to the constant Method. And if it be pretended, that their first Election was void ; I observe farther, that they have continued in the Possession of their Dioceses ever since the Decease of the Deprived Bishops, and all their Clergy and People own and submit to them, as their Bishops : which is at least of as much Force as a new Election, if they had wanted it. For certainly in the Reason of the Thing, a Bishop's being actually acknowledged by all the Persons in his Diocese, cannot be of less Authority, than his being chosen by a Dean and Chapter.

And by the way, this shews, that the Illustrations which Dr. *Hickes* applies to this Point (t), do not come up to it ;

(t) *Pag.* 237----260.

because he only considers our Bishops; as having been acknowledged by their Dioceses before the Decease of the Deprived Bishops, but takes no notice of their having been submitted to ever since. For Example, he puts this Case (u). *Suppose that Brutus, by a powerful Faction, drives Cæsar, the rightful King of the Elective Kingdom of Poland from his Throne, and by Force keeps Possession till Cæsar dies. And then the Doctor asks; Whether by Cæsar's death, Brutus's Wrong becomes Right? Whether the Poles are bound to obey him without a new Election, or the Ratification of his former void Election? To which I answer; Supposing that by Cæsar's Death, Brutus's Wrong does not become Right; yet by his continuing to sit upon the Throne, and being freely acknowledged and submitted to by all the Electors, or a great Majority of them, he will become rightful King, without a new Election, or a formal Ratification of his former Election*.* And this I take to be agreeable to the common Sense and Practice of Mankind. And therefore Dr. *Hickes* himself would have answered the many Pages he has spent upon this Head,

(u) P. 240.
Clergy, p. 68, 69.

* V. Mr. Dodwel's *Indep. of the*

if he had inserted proper Words, as he has improper ones, to explain Mr. Dodwel's Reasoning. For whereas he proposes Mr. Dodwel's Argument thus; *A* (former) *unanimous actual Reception* (in Rebellion), &c. He should have proposed it in these Words; *A* (continued) *unanimous actual Reception* (after the Demise of the rightful King) *by the concluding Votes of the whole Body of Electors, has the same force in Elective Successions, that Devolution can pretend to in those that are Hereditary.* But to return.

Tho' we should grant, for Argument sake, that our present Bishops had no Right to their Dioceses, till the Decease of the Deprived Bishops; yet now they certainly have a Right. For their Consecration being valid, they could not want to be new Consecrated, but like Suffragans, and Bishops, translated from one See to another, they only wanted to be nominated by the King, and capitularly Elect-ed, and Confirmed by the Archbishop. They are, as I before observed, submitted to by not only the Dean and Chapter, but their whole Diocese; and that is at least of equal Authority with a Capitular Election. They are own'd by all the Diocesans of *England*; which is at least equal to the Confirmation of the

R

Arch.

Archbishop of one Province. The Church then has done her Part to make them Bishops of their Dioceses. The supreme Civil Powers in Possession, own and approve of these Bishops; and that also is the same in Effect with a new Nomination. And tho' we should suppose these Powers to be only Supreme *de Facto*; yet it has been fully proved by several (w), that such Acts of Kings *de Facto*, as the Nomination of Bishops, are valid, according to our Constitution. And besides, our Adversaries cannot, according to their own Principles, pretend, that the Church is not able of her self to give a Man a Right to a Diocese, nor reject the Title of our Bishops, barely for want of that Nomination of the Temporal Prince, which they complain of (x) as an *unchristian Imposition and Tyranny*. However, if our Adversaries should be so inconsistent with themselves, as to reject our Bishops purely on this Account, this plainly brings the Matter to a mere Civil Dispute about the Rights of Princes.

Thus have I shewn, that even supposing our Bishops to have been Schismatical,

(w) Particularly by Dr. Higden. Hickes, p. 86, 314.

(x) V. Dr.

cal, they are, by the Decease of their Rivals, become Catholick and Rightful Diocesans. And this is agreeable to the Sense of the Primitive Church in the like Cases. Mr. Dodwel declares (y), *he cannot find, that the Catholick Church ever doubted of the Right of a single Person in a vacant See, after the Death of an injured Predecessor.* On the contrary, it is certain, that she has acknowledged the Right of such surviving Bishops; whereof I shall mention one remarkable Instance, which may serve instead of many.

Meletius had been constituted Bishop of *Antioch* (z), and while he was living in Exile, *Lucifer* of *Sardinia* coming to *Antioch*, took upon him to constitute *Paulinus* Bishop thereof (a). Upon the Return of *Meletius*, there was a great Contention between the Followers of the two Bishops: which was at length agreed upon these Terms; that the Six Presbyters who were most likely to be chosen Bishops, of whom *Flavianus* was one, should swear, that they would neither endeavour to be chosen to that Bishoprick, nor accept of the Bishoprick, if they were chosen, so long

(y) *Case in View*, p. 82.

(z) *Socrat. l. 2. c. 44.*

(a) *Idem. l. 3. c. 6. Sozom. l. 5. c. 12.*

as *Paulinus* or *Meletius* lived ; but that upon the Death of either of them, they would submit to the Survivor, as the rightful and only Bishop (b).

Notwithstanding this Agreement, upon the Death of *Meletius*, *Flavianus* was made Bishop of *Antioch*, on pretence, that *Paulinus* was Heterodox. But the Bishop of *Rome* would not acknowledge *Flavianus*, because he had before acknowledged *Paulinus*, and disowned *Meletius*; and the Bishops of *Egypt*, *Arabia* and *Cyprus*, would not acknowledge *Flavianus*, being offended with him for having continued the Division, and violated his Oath (c). Yet after the Death of *Paulinus*, and of *Evagrius*, whom *Paulinus*, contrary to the Canons, consecrated for his Successor in his Life time, the Bishops of *Alexandria* and *Rome*, acknowledged *Flavianus*, as *Sozomen* supposes (d), because his Rival was dead ; but most certainly, without *Flavianus*'s making any Satisfaction. For *Socrates* tells us (e) “ That *Theophilus* reconciled *Damasus*

(b) Socrat. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. (c) Soc. l. 5. c. 15. Soz. l. 7. c. 11. (d) Sozom. l. 8 c. 3. Καὶ τὸ πρῶτον, οἱ μὲν, εὐμαρεῖς ἐγένοντο τοῖς ἐπισκόποις αἱ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν, μηδενὸς ἐναντίον ὄντος. (e) Socrat. l. 5. c. 15. Καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς λυσιπλεῖας δάμασμον, λυσιπλεῖν εἰπὼν, δι' ὁμοῦσιαν τῷ λαῷ, παρελθεῖν τὸ φθάναι φλαβιανῶν πηλημελίην. ἕως τε τῷ φλαβιανῶ τῆς κριτικῆς ἀποδοθείσης, κ. τ. λ.

“ to *Flavianus*, advising him, that to unite
 “ the People he would *over-look* the Of-
 “ fence of *Flavianus* : and that SO *Flavia-*
 “ *nus* obtained the Communion of *Dama-*
 “ *sus*.” Now if *Damasus* had obliged
Flavianus to make Satisfaction for the Of-
 fence, he would not have overlooked it.

Almost all the Bishops of the Church of
 Christ took part, either with *Meletius* and
Flavianus, or with *Paulinus*. Now, on
 the one hand, *Meletius* and his Followers,
 by consenting to the above-mentioned
 Agreement, declared, that in case *Meletius*
 should die, the Cause of the Schism would
 thereby cease, and *Paulinus* become right-
 ful Bishop : And on the other hand, the
Western, Egyptian, and other Bishops, who
 before esteemed *Flavianus* to be a Schis-
 matical Intruder, did actually, upon the
 Death of his Rivals *Paulinus* and *Evagri-*
us, acknowledge him to be the rightful
 Bishop of *Antioch*, without requiring any
 Satisfaction.

Object. 1. “ What is at first invalid, will
 “ not obtain Force by Time, unless the
 “ Impediment cease, and a new Cause su-
 “ pervene (f).”

(f) V. Dr. Hickes, p. 315.

Answ. I have shewn, that the Impediment is removed, by the Decease of the Deprived Bishops; and also, that since their Decease, our Bishops have been acknowledged by those who have a Right to constitute Diocesans: which is a new Cause, and sufficient to make their Titles good, if they had been defective.

Object. 2. Dr. *Hickes* objects (*g*) against the Regal Nomination of our present Bishops, "Where Patronage is in use, there's no Prescription allowed against a Rightful Patron, by long uncontroverted Possession."

Answ. This is far from being universally true. For the Fee of an Advowson may be gained by Usurpation divers Ways (*h*). But supposing it to be true; yet if a Clerk be instituted and inducted upon the Presentment of an usurping Patron, no rightful Patron, except the King, can Eject him, unless he bring a *quare impedit* within Six Months after the said Clerk's Induction. And such a Clerk originally could not have been ejected at all, after he was once

(*g*) Pag. 262. (*h*) *Vid.* Watson's *Complete Incumbent*, c. 13, p. 88, &c. Coke's *Second Institutes*, pag. 358, &c.

instituted; till *Westminster the Second*,
Cap. 5. allow'd Six Months Time to
the Rightful Patron to bring a *quare*
impedit in. And the Reasons of this are
said to be (i), that the Incumbent may
more peaceably attend his spiritual Charge;
and because, when a fit Person is admitted,
the Law has its final Intention, viz. that
the Church should sufficiently be provided
for.

Dr. *Hickes* goes on; "More particular-
" ly by the *English* Laws and Constitu-
" tion (there is no Prescription allow'd)
" against our Kings and Queens, the
" Patrons of our Bishopricks, in behalf
" of whose Prerogative, *Nullum tempus*
" *occurrit Regi*, is a received Maxim and
" Rule in Law.

Answ. This also is not universally true.
For if the King have only the Patronage
for one particular Turn, and a Clerk be
instituted and inducted upon another's
Presentment, and die Incumbent; the King
cannot recover his Right to Present, nor
remove the Patron's Second Presentee;
and in such a Case, *Tempus occurrit*
Regi (k).

(i) *Coke's First Institutes*, f. 344. and *Second Insti-*
tutes, p. 357. (k) *Vid. Coke's Second Institutes*,
p. 361. *Watson*, c. 12. p. 78.

But supposing, that where the King is Patron, he might always Eject such a Clerk, who is instituted and inducted upon the Presentment of an usurping Patron; yet when a Clerk is so inducted, he is complete Incumbent against the King, as well as any Subject; and therefore in such a Case, "The King cannot
 " Present, till the Incumbent is removed, neither can he remove him any
 " way, but by Action, to the End the
 " Church may be the more quiet in
 " the mean Time, and a Confirmation
 " being made by the King to such Presentee, is good to establish his Possession against a Recovery in a *quare impedit* by the King afterward; and yet
 " this Confirmation operates not to the
 " amending the Estate of the Usurper;
 " but if the King doth make to the Usurper a Release, it is void (1)." And if such an one were complete Incum-

(1) *Vid.* Watson, c. 13. p. 87. Coke upon Littleton, f. 344. b. Sir George Croke's Reports, Part 2. p. 123. The Court of Kings-Bench resolved that Usurpation upon the King and Plenarty should bind him *quoad* the Possession, until he remove the Incumbent by *quare impedit*; for Reason requireth, that the Church be served; and one being in by Presentment, and according to the Ceremonies of the Church, cannot be put out without Action,

bent,

bent, he had a Right in Law, not only to the Tithes, but to all those spiritual Duties, which Parishioners owe to their respective Pastors.

Answ. 2. Whether Prescription can be allowed against our Kings and Queens, as Patrons of our Bishopricks has never yet come in Question; but, supposing our Civil Powers to be only supreme *de facto*, the Title of our Bishops to their Dioceses is good in Law, not only on account of Prescription, but because without Prescription or long Possession, the Nomination of a Bishop by a King *de facto* is, as I before observed, valid according to our Constitution; and all our Bishops, except one or two, were either Bishops before the Revolution, or have since been legally nominated by our Civil Powers to Sees confessedly vacant; and those two have, ever since the Decease of their Deprived Predecessors, been acknowledged by our Civil Powers; which I have shewn to be the same in effect with a new Nomination.

But we are told by a late Author (*m*), that a *de facto* King could not make a Bishop.

(*m*) *Viz. The Author of Hereditary Right.*

Answ.

Answ. I cannot find one Example since the Conquest of a Bishop's being removed, because he was constituted in the Reign of a King *de facto*. But, to be particular, it is manifest there are no such Examples since the Reformation. During the Prevalency of the Papal Usurpation, the Authority which our Kings exercised in constituting Bishops, consisted in giving Licence to Elect, and after the Election was made, consenting to it, and restoring the Temporalities; and if the Election was made without the King's License, he commonly refused to restore the Temporalities.

Now in the first Place our Adversaries have not yet pretended to produce, and I am fully persuaded, are not able to produce, one single Instance, since the Conquest, when any Act necessary to constitute a Bishop, as to Spiritualities, or done by a King *de facto*, or in the Reign of such a King, was on *that Account* adjudged void, or so much as called in question.

But they imagine, that the 1 *Edw.* 4. *cap.* 1. proves, that Restitutions of Temporalities made by Kings *de facto* were void, because it confirms the Restitutions of Temporalities made to Bishops by the

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 251

the preceding Kings of the *Lancaster* Line.

Answ. The Parliament indeed, which made that Statute, carried the Distinction between a King *de facto* and *de jure*, higher than any since. Yet *First* Their confirming those Restitutions of Temporalities, without *declaring* the Election of those Bishops to be Valid (tho at the same Time they *declared* the Creation of Noblemen to be Valid); and without requiring those Bishops to be Elected again, or any Act to be repeated, which was necessary to constitute them Diocesans as to Spiritualities, shews, that there was not the least doubt then made, but that those Bishops were strictly legal Diocesans as to Spiritualities. *Secondly*, The Confirmation of those Restitutions of Temporalities, does by no means prove, that they were thought to be void before. For the Bishops might procure this Confirmation out of abundant Caution; because a wise Man, tho' he knows his Title to be good, will get it confirm'd, if there be any Appearance of its being question'd, not only to prevent all possible Hazard, but the Trouble and Vexation of defending it. And it was common, probably for these Reasons, to have Charters granted by preceding

ceding Kings confirm'd by their Successors.

And there is nothing in that Statute to imply, that the Restitutions therein confirmed were at first void; on the contrary it appears to have been a *Declaratory Statute*, that is, a Statute design'd, not to create a new Validity, but to *declare*, that the Acts confirmed by it were Valid before. For thus it begins; *First in eschewing of Ambiguities, Doubts, and Diversities of Opinions, which may rise of and upon Judicial Acts made, or had in the Times of (the Three Henrys) late Kings of England successively, in Deed and not of Right, our said Lord the King, by the Advice and Assent of his Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Request of his Commons in the said Parliament, and by Authority of the same, hath DECLARED, Established and Enacted, That all Fines and all Judicial Acts made, or had in any of the pretended Reigns of any of the said late Kings, shall be of like Force, Virtue, and Effect, as if the Premises were had or determined in the Time of any King obtaining the Crown of this Realm by just Title.*

And farther; the Matters Enacted by this Statute, would have shewn it to have been *Declaratory*, tho' the Term, *Declared*, had not been used. For this Statute confirms

firms Judicial Acts: and yet it was afterward taken for granted in the Arguments in *Bagot's Case* (*n*), that all Judicial Acts done by *Henry* the Sixth, while he was King, would have been valid without this Statute. And a Charter of Denization was adjudged good, tho' not confirmed by this or any other Statute of *Edward* the Fourth.

And the Term, *Declared*, which is used in the first *general* Clause above mentioned, ought to be applied to that *particular* Clause, which confirms the Restitutions of Temporalities, tho' it happens not to be therein repeated, but only the Term, *Enacted*. For, *Enacted*, is plainly in this Statute used in the same Sense, as *Declared*. For in several subsequent Clauses it is *Enacted*, that some particular Judicial Acts shall be valid, which were before *Declared* to be valid in the first *general* Clause: For Instance, the 5th Section *enacts*, that Grants and Assignments of Dower shall be valid; which were manifestly Things of Common Right.

The second Section *Declares* Letters Patents of Creation of Noblemen, to be valid. From whence it follows more

(*n*) 9 Edw. 4. 1, 2, 6, 11.

strongly, that the Constitution of Bishops was valid: for that certainly is more necessary, and depends less upon Kings, than Creating Noblemen does: And if the Constitution of Bishops were valid in Law, the Restitution of Temporalities was a Judicial Act, and a Thing of common Right, at least much more so than a Charter of Denization, or a Patent for a Nobleman.

The same Section directs, that the Noblemen should have *new Grants of the King of their Annuities*, but not of their Honours. The reason of which difference seems to be, that it was then the Opinion of the Lawyers, that such Acts of Kings *de facto*, which tended to the Diminution of the Crown, were not valid (o). And therefore, tho' that Parliament did declare the Grants of Honours made by the *Henrys* to be valid; yet it would not declare their Grants of Annuities or Crown Revenue to Noblemen, nor their Grants of Lands and Hereditaments to Abbies and Pories, to be valid. And this is another Proof, that that Parliament understood these Restitutions of Temporalities to be valid, previously to that Act; be-

(o) *V. Bagot's Case above mentioned.*

cause otherwise they would, in all probability, have required, that Bishops should have had new Restitutions of their Temporalties, as they did, that Noblemen should take out new Grants of their Annuities.

And the Law was so settled in this Reign by this *Declaratory Statute*, and the Opinion of the Judges was so clear in the Case of *Bagot*, that there seems to have been no doubt made of these Matters in King *Henry the Seventh's Time*. They then esteemed *Richard the Third* to have been only a *de facto* King; and therefore the Parliament, in the first Year of *Henry the Seventh*, stiled him only *Duke of Gloucester* (p). And afterward, when Mens Passions against him were probably cooler, the 3 *H. 7. cap. 3.* stiles him *King in Deed, and not of Right*. And my Lord *Bacon*, in the beginning of his History of *Henry the Seventh*, calls *Richard the Third* *King in Fact only, but Tyrant both in Title and Regiment, and so commonly termed and reputed in all Times since*. And yet none of the Bishops constituted in *Richard the Third's Reign* (q) were removed, nor the Restitution of their Temporalties confirmed.

(p) V. *The Title of 1 H. 7. cap. 6. in Keble's Statute Book, and Dr. Higden's English Constit. p. 36.*

(q) There were several Bishops made in this Reign, and also Deans, and

firmed. On the contrary, a Pardon was granted to all them who assisted King Henry in his Wars against Richard Duke of Gloucester (r); probably because in Bagot's Case it was taken for granted in the Arguments of his Counsel, that a Treason against Henry the Sixth, in compassing his Death, was punishable after Edward the Fourth came to the Crown.

Upon the whole then, it is certain, both that such Acts done in the Reigns of Kings *de facto*, which were necessary to constitute Bishops, as to Spiritualties, were always esteemed good in Law: and also, that our Adversaries cannot infer from the 1 Ed. 4. cap. 1. that the Parliament which made that Statute, judged the Restitutions of Temporalties in the Reigns of Kings *de facto*, to be void; tho' that is what it was brought to prove. But all that they can necessarily conclude from it is, that the Parliament apprehended some Doubt

and probably Abbots, whose Case was the same with that of Bishops, (V. 1 Ed. 4. cap. 1.) Tho. Langton was first made Bishop of St. Davids, and then translated to Salisbury. (V. Mr. Le Neve's *Fasti Ecclesie Anglicane*, p. 513; 259). John Sherwood was made Bishop of Durham, (Ibid. p. 349.) William Benley and John Morgan were successively made Deans of Windsor, (Ibid. p. 375.) (r) V. The Title of 1 Hen. 7. cap. 6. in Keble's *Statute Book*.

might

might rise, whether those Restitutions of Temporalities were valid or no. And to prevent such a Doubt, that Statute declared them to be valid; and the Practice ever since, particularly in King *Hen.* the 7th's Reign, has confirmed that they are valid. So that this very Statute evinces the Legality of our Bishops, which it was brought to disprove.

But should we, to gratify our Adversaries, suppose, that as that Incumbent is removable by Action, who upon the Presentment of an Usurping Patron fills a Church, whereof the King is perpetual Patron; So the Restitutions of Temporalities made by Kings *de facto* were violable: yet since such an Incumbent is complete Incumbent till he is actually removed, we might by Parity of Reason infer, that such Restitutions would be valid to all Intents and Purposes, till they were avoided; and consequently that Bishops constituted in the Reigns of Kings *de facto*, would be, in the Eye of the Law, complete Bishops, till they should be actually removed by the King *de jure* upon his Regrefs.

If therefore for the Sins of this Nation, God should in Judgment place the Pretender upon the Throne of this Kingdom; and if it could be supposed, that in such

a Case any Regard would be had to the Law; all our Bishops, except one or two, must be then indisputably adjudg'd to be complete Bishops in the Eye of our Law, till they should be actually removed; and consequently our Adversaries must allow our present Bishops to be legal ones, and that by our Law they have a Right to the Temporalties and Spiritualties of their Bishopricks, and to that Obedience of their respective Dioceses which is due to rightful Diocesans.

And farther, I cannot but observe again, that if our Bishops were not strictly legal Diocesans; yet for our Adversaries to deny their Authority, for a Defect in Civil Forms, who are rightful Diocesans, as far as the Church can make them so, is to assert, when it serves their Turn, that Dependency of the Church upon the State, which at other Times they inveigh against as a most *unrighteous Usurpation* (f).

Object. 3. "We cannot close into Communion with you, till you come over to the Church, and repent of and acknowledge your Schism, and make Satisfaction to the Church for having

(f) *Vid. Dr. Hickes, p. 29.*

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 259

“ broken her Peace and Unity, and have
“ your Orders confirmed (1).

As to the *first* Branch of this Objection, I have shewn, that supposing us to have been Schismatics, we are now, upon the decease of the Nonjuring Bishops, become Members of the Church again, and consequently *are, come over to her*. But if our Adversaries mean, that we should *come over* in the strictest Sense of the Expression, wherein it signifies, to forbear opposing those who once were our Adversaries, and instead thereof, to adhere to them against those whom we formerly followed: I answer, that we do not any more oppose the Deprived Bishops, but that we cannot adhere to them, because they are dead; nor can we oppose our present Bishops, because they are now our Rightful Diocesans.

As to the *second* Branch of this Objection, Dr. *Hickes* says, *till we repent we shall be accountable, and our Guilt must be imputed to us*.

Ans. 1. This is a good Argument, that if we have sin'd, we ought to repent. Whereas his Business was, not to prove, what we ought to do, but that

(1) *Vid.* Dr. *Hickes*, p. 156, 206, &c. and 236.

we do not repent, and that our forbearing to repent will justify their continuing to separate from us. Men who have been guilty of Excess in Drinking, or profane Swearing, or the like Crimes, ought undoubtedly to repent: but if they do not, this will not warrant us to break off Ecclesiastical Communion with them. And in like Manner, supposing that we have not repented, neither this, nor indeed any other Pretence would be a sufficient Ground for our Adversaries to refuse any longer to unite with us: since, as I have proved, we are not *now* Schismatics, tho' we should for Argument-sake grant, that we *once* were so.

But Dr. *Hickes* seems to take our supposed Impenitence for a Proof that *we continue bound in our Sin and Schism* (u).

Ans. 2. If we had been Schismatics, our not repenting would prove us still guilty of *having been* formerly Schismatics, but not of *being* Schismatics now. And it may be a Man's Duty to communicate with those, who are guilty of *having been* Schismatics, as well as to separate from those, who are guilty of

(u) Pag. 209, 157.

being Schismatics. As it may be criminal to correspond with those, who are guilty of *Rebelling*; and yet, after the Rebellion is over, it may be lawful, to correspond with those, who are guilty of *having Rebelled*. Suppose that in the Reign of King *Charles the Second*, upon passing the Test Act, some Dissenters had from thence-forward communicated with the Church, not because they repented, but out of Ambition and Interest; they would thereupon have been in external Communion with the Church; and if a Man had known them to have continued impenitent, this would not have justified him in separating from them, and thereby from the Church wherewith they communicated.

Ans. 3. If a Man might lawfully separate from a Church, because she had been Schismatical, and he *knew*, that she had not yet repented of it: yet he could not, barely because he *imagined*, that she had not repented. *Outward* Repentance is to cease to do those sinful Actions, which we before committed. And when Men *cease to do Evil*, we ought to presume, that they have *inwardly* repented, unless there be Proof to the contrary. Now our supposed Sin consisted in opposing the pretended Diocesan Authority of those

particular Persons; who were Deprived. But we do not at present oppose the Authority of them or any rightful Diocesans. How then can our Adversaries be *sure*, that our Church has not truly repented, or what Church-Act can they prove it from?

The *third* Branch of this Objection is, *that we ought to acknowledge our Schism*, which Dr. *Hickes* attempts to prove, 1. *Because there is an eternal Congruity between Pardon and Repentance (w).*

Answ. 1. True: But Repentance does not necessarily require a particular Confession of all our Sins, even to God in private. For a Man may have committed Sins which he has forgot, or which he does not know to be Sins, but rather thinks them to be Virtues. And if his Heart be sincere in God's Service, God will undoubtedly pardon such Sins, upon a general Repentance and Confession. Much less does Repentance require, that we should make a particular Confession of our Sins to Men. On the contrary, our Church does every Day upon a general Confession pronounce Absolution.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 263

Answ. 2. Tho' it were necessary for him who had been a Schismatick to make a particular Confession of it, in order to obtain God's Pardon; yet it would not follow, that his forbearing to do so, would justify others in dividing from him; as I before observed with relation to Repentance.

Dr. Hicke's other Argument is, *For us to communicate with you, before you acknowledge your Schism, would be for the Church to go over to Schismatics (x).*

Answ. 1. This shews, that our Adversaries are unwilling to unite, for fear of the Disgrace of being thought to yield.
2. When the Ground of Contention is removed, the contending Parties often unite without either Side's *going over to the other* in the strictest Sense of the Words. Suppose, that during a War between several Princes contending for a certain Kingdom, All of them should die but one, who before claimed wrongfully, but thereupon came to have the sole and undoubted Right; and suppose that then all Sides should join together in owning this Title: In such a Case it could not be more properly said, that

(x) Pag. 208.

those who before opposed him, were *gone over* to their Adversaries; than that their Adversaries were *gone over* to them; and therefore it could not be strictly said of either of them.

The *fourth* Branch of this Objection is,
 “ That we should, according to the Pri-
 “ mitive Practice, satisfy the Church for
 “ breaking her Peace and Unity, and
 “ make amends for the bad Precedent
 “ we have introduced of Laymens De-
 “ priving Clergymen.

Ans. 1. If it were necessary for us to make Satisfaction, it would not from thence follow, that our Adversaries might lawfully refuse to communicate with us, till we had made it. So when an Offender is enjoined to do Penance, it is not therefore allowable in others to divide from him, till he has done it; much less, before he is enjoined to do it.

Ans. 2. Such a Satisfaction is not in it self necessary, nor always expedient. For the chief End of it is the Good of the Church, and therefore it may be omitted, when the insisting rigidly upon it would hinder a greater Good, *viz.* Publick Peace and Unity.

Ans. 3. When a bad Precedent is introduced, private Men may in some Cases protest against it, which our Adversaries have

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 265

have sufficiently done, supposing this to have been a bad one: But those only can command Reparation to be made, who are vested with Authority. For he who disobeys those who have no Right to command him, is guilty of no Crime. And besides, "Penance and Publick Satisfaction must, if imposed on all, be imposed as Conditions of Communion, and consequently can be imposed by none but those who have the Power of denying and granting Communion, *i.e.* by Bishops vested with Jurisdiction (y). And Bishops without Dioceses, cannot exercise any Episcopal Jurisdiction here, according to the Rules of our Church, and according to the standing Rules of all the Provinces of the Christian Church, since Dioceses have been erected (z). And the pretended Nonjuring Bishops have confessedly no Dioceses, and therefore are, to borrow an Expression of Dr. *Hickes* (a), *Strangers to the Constitution of the Church of England, whose Call and Voices we are not bound to hear.* So that for our Adversaries, who are destitute of Authority, and also few in Number, to insist upon Amendments for a Precedent, when the pre-

(y) *Mr. Dodwell's Further Prospect*, p. 10. (z) *Vid. 34 Can. Apostol.* (a) *Pag. 203.*

tended

tended Evil it self is at an end; and so to continue the Breaches of the Church, under Pretence of Zeal for her Welfare, is without Precedent, and without Excuse. Let us again put the Case of a Civil Prince, who had once been guilty of unjustly intruding into the Throne of another Prince, but upon the Death of his Rival became indisputably Rightful Possessor, and nothing could be objected against him but his former Usurpation: Could a few private Men justly call him to Account for the bad Precedent he had introduced, and under Colour of demanding Satisfaction of him, keep up a Civil War in the Bowels of their Native Country.

Answ. 4. As to the Practice of the Primitive Church, Mr. *Dodwel* declares, " That
 " Satisfaction was never, that he knew of,
 " insisted on, as essential to a Coalition:
 " That Penance was not ordinarily imposed on Bishops after the Fourth Century; and that it was judged improper
 " to impose it on such Bishops, who were
 " thought fit to be continued in their
 " Office after a Settlement: but that he
 " did not know one Instance of Penance
 " imposed by a smaller Number of Orthodox Bishops, as a Condition of Peace,
 " upon a much greater Number of Ad-
 " versary

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 267

“versary Bishops (b). Much less was it ever known, that a few Persons without Jurisdiction, should require Provincial Colleges of Bishops to give Satisfaction.

But against this our Adversaries urge,
 I. “*That the Council of Nice would not receive the Novatians, nor that of Carthage the Donatists, without acknowledging and satisfying for their Crime.*

Ans. It is most probable, that the Council of Carthage did not Decree, that the *Donatists* should make any Acknowledgment or Satisfaction, except what was imply’d in their communicating with the Church (c). And it is certain, that a few
 Years

(b) *Further Prospect*, p. 13, 16, 17, 18. *Case in Fact*, p. 34.

(c) Οἱ ὅτις δέποτε κληρικοί, διορθωμένης τῆς βουλῆς, πρὸς τὴν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν μεταστρέψαντες ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις πνευματικαῖς αὐτῶν ἀναδιχάζονται. *Can. 68. Concil. Carthag. Edit. per Binium.* These Words only express, that the *Donatist* Clergymen, who should change their Minds, and unite themselves to the Church, should be received with the Honours they had among the *Donatists*: Whereby no more perhaps was meant, than their communicating with the Church. For that alone was then a Proof of their changing their Minds, when the Cause of the Schism continued. But because Change of Mind or Repentance is mention’d, Dr. *Hickes*, (p. 209.) according to his Custom, will have it, that Satisfaction and Acknowledgment are understood. In the same Place he quotes the 69th Canon of the same Council, as if it were to his purpose. In that Canon the Council decreed to send Deputies to preach Peace to the *Donatists*, and

Years after, at the Collation of *Carthage*, the Catholick Bishops did indeed unanimously promise, if they were worsted in the Conference, to give Satisfaction to the *Donatists*, by not claiming the Episcopal Dignity: but if they got the Advantage, they obliged themselves, instead of requiring any Submission from the *Donatists*, to treat them perfectly upon the Level; proposing, that where there were two Bishops in a Diocese, a Catholick and a *Donatist* one, either they should govern it jointly; or else both should resign, and a new Bishop be chosen (*d*): And this, tho' the Civil Power then favour'd the Catholics (*e*), and the Number of the *Donatists* was much diminish'd (*f*). So that this Objection has occasion'd me to

to represent to them, that since they themselves had received the Maximianists (who had subdivided from the Donatists, as the Donatists had divided from the Catholics), without requiring them to be Rebaptized or Reordained, they did foolishly in opposing the Peace of the Church, as they did, viz. by insisting, that the Catholics should be Rebaptized and Reordained, before they would unite with them. (Conf. Baronium, Anno 401. 12.) Now hereby it appears, 1. that the *Donatists* did then, like our Adversaries now, require Satisfaction of the Catholics, but not, that the Catholics required any of the *Donatists*. 2. That the *Donatists* did not require of the *Maximinists*, the particular Satisfaction of submitting to be Rebaptized or Reordained, but not, that they did require any other Satisfaction.

(*d*) V. Collat. Carthag. 1 Di. Cap. 5. (e) V. Baronium Anno 410. 49, 51. (f) Idem. 411. 6.

pro-

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 269

produce a Second clear Instance of the Church's acknowledging Adversary Bishops without Satisfaction (g).

But supposing the Council of *Carthage* to have required a Recantation from the *Donatists*, as we own the Council of *Nice* did from the *Novatians*; I answer, 1. that at the respective Times, when those Councils were held, the Causes of those Schisms were not removed: but on the contrary, there were then in several Cities, Schismatical Antidiocefans, set up in opposition to the Catholick Diocefans (h). 2, and principally, It is manifest, that the Council of *Nice* being OEcumenical, had Authority to exercise Discipline over the *Novatians*, and that the Council of *Carthage* also had Authority to exercise Discipline over all the *Donatists* in that Province. But I am yet to learn, how a few Christians without Diocefans, can claim an Authority, to call all the rightful Diocefans of *England* to account.

2. Our Adversaries urge, "That when
" *St. John Chrysostom* was unjustly Depo-

(g) See the other Instance, *supra* p. 243. (h) This appears, as to the *Novatians*, from the 8th Canon of the Council of *Nice*; and as to the *Donatists*, from the above mentioned 68th and 69th Canons of the Council of *Carthage*, and from the Collation of *Carthage*.

" fed,

“ fed, and *Arsacius*, and upon *Arsacius*’s
 “ Death, *Atticus*, were put in his place
 “ while he was living, the whole Catho-
 “ lick Church, excepting the *small Alex-
 “ drian Faëtion*, would not communicate
 “ with *Arsacius*, nor *Atticus* neither, even
 “ after *St. Chrysostom*’s Death, till he had
 “ written his Name in the Diptychs, and
 “ expunged *Arsacius*’s, and thereby ac-
 “ knowledged *Chrysostom* to be the Right-
 “ ful Bishop of *Constantinople* to his Death,
 “ and satisfy’d the Church for having in-
 “ terrupted her Succession; that those
 “ who thus adhered to *Chrysostom* were in
 “ the right, and that consequently the
 “ Nonconforming Nonjurors cannot be in
 “ the wrong, in insisting upon the like
 “ Satisfaction (i). The Historical Col-
 “ lector spends 68 Pages in Quarto upon
 “ this Instance (k). Dr. *Hickes* beseeches Mr.
 “ Nelson to read and apply it. And the Let-
 “ ter written by his Order, has these Ex-
 “ pressions concerning it. *This Instance is*
so glorious a Vindication of our Practice,
that it is with the greatest earnestness I
beg of you to consider it seriously again and
again.

(i) V. Dr. Hickes, p. 156, 158---161. 193---197.

(k) Viz. In his Excerpts.

Ans.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 271

Answ. I have considered it, and find, that this Support, which our Adversaries rely so much upon, is a broken Reed; and when examined to the bottom, proves more hurtful than beneficial to their Cause. And,

1. Before our Adversaries had built so much upon this Example, they ought not to have supposed, but to have shewn, that the *Joannites* (l) were in the right, and that we may safely imitate them. *St. Chrysostom's* Case was this (m). *Arcadius* was then Emperor of the East, and his Brother *Honorius* of the West. *Arcadius's* Empress *Eudoxia*, being offended with *St. Chrysostom*, procured *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, to come to the Synod at *Quercum*, near *Chalcedon*, to try him for some pretended Crimes. *Chrysostom* refused to appear before the Synod, because it was contrary to the Canons, that *Theophilus* should be a Member of it, who was *Chrysostom's* professed Enemy, and had then several Accusations preferred against himself, of which he was not yet acquit-

(l) So the Adherents of *St. John Chrysostom* were called from his Name.

(m) See this History in *Socrat. E. H. l. 6. c. 15. &c.* *Sozom. l. 8. c. 16, &c.* and in *Palladius's* Life of *Chrysostom*.

ted,

ted, and had no Authority out of his own District. The Synod Deposed St. *Chrysostom* for not appearing; and *Arcadius* sent him away into Banishment. But this made the People so tumultuous, that he was presently recalled. Upon his Return, he refused at first, to come into *Constantinople*, or to act as Bishop, till he should be restored by the Judgment of a greater Synod. But this made the People again so tumultuous, that it became necessary for him to return into the City; and the People meeting him, conducted him to the Church, and between Perswasion and Force, prevailed upon him to resume his Episcopal Throne, and exercise his Function, as usual. Not long after the Animosities revived between him and the Empress; and a *Second* Synod was assembled, which confirmed the former Sentence against him, without suffering him to make his Defence, on this Allegation, that he had repossessed himself of his See, contrary to a Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, "That if any Bishop
 " Deposed by a Synod, whether justly or
 " unjustly, should of himself return to
 " his Church, before that Sentence was
 " reversed by a greater Synod, he should
 " be finally Deposed, without any Liberty
 " to

“ to defend himself, or hope of Restoration (n).

The first Deposition of *Chrysostom* seems to have been uncanonical; but whether the second were so or no, *Socrates*, who lived at that Time, was doubtful (o), and we have no reason to be positive. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* inform us (p), that “ when *Chrysostom*, in answer to the Objection, that he had violated that Canon, pleaded, that sixty five Bishops had Decreed his Restoration; His Adversaries replied, That a Synod of more Bishops had condemned him: And “ when he pleaded again, That the Canon “ was null, being made by *Arians*, that “ they might have a Pretence to confirm “ *Athanasius*’s Deposition, without hearing him; this Plea also was over-ruled.

(n) *Vid.* *Palladium*, p. 78. and 12 *Can. Concil. Antioch.*

(o) *Hist. Eccl.* l. 6. c. 19. Πότερον δικαία ἡ καθαίρεσις Ἰωάννου κατὰ τὸ λόγον ἢ λυπηθείων ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ————
Θεὸς ἂν εἴη, ὃ τὸ κρυπτόν γινώσκει, ὃ ἔα αὐτῆς τὴν ἀληθείαν κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην.

(p) *Socrat. Hist. Eccl.* l. 6. c. 18. Ἰωάννης λέγωντι, ὡς ἐξηκουσθέντες ἐπίσκοποι κοινωνήσαντες αὐτῷ ἐψηφίσαντο οἱ πρὸς λεόντιον ἀντιπῆγον· ἀλλὰ πολλοί, ὃν Ἰωάννης, κατηψήσαντό σε ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ. ἐπὶ ἧ παλιν ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν κανόνα τῶτον, ὃ τὸ αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὁρσιανῶν εἶναι ἔλεγε ———— μὴ πρὸς ἀξίους τοὺς ἀπολογίας κατηψήσαντο. *Sozom. L. 8. c. 20.*

Theodoret (q), and *Palladius* (r), relate, that *Chrysostom* and his Adherents pleaded, “ That he had not really been Deposed at first, (*viz.* as not having been Deposed by a competent Synod); that he had not returned to his See of himself, but by the Emperor’s Command; and that the Canon was null, having been made by *Arians*.” But tho’ they observed, that he was restored by the Emperor’s Command; neither they nor *Palladius* ever take notice, that his Restoration was confirm’d or decreed by any Synod. Nor does *Chrysostom* in his Letter to *Innocent*, then Bishop of *Rome*, (f) affirm any such Matter, but rather the contrary. For he says, “ That he desired, that a Synod might be had, to animadvert upon what had past; which was prevented by *Theophilus*’s Flight to *Alexandria*: That he still insisted to be tried, being ready to prove himself innocent: That there were some *Syrians*, who had joined with *Theophilus* in carrying on the Plot against him; and that he soli-

(q) H. E. l. 5.

(r) De Vita *Chrysost.* p. 78, 79. This Life of *Chrysostom* passes under the Name of *Palladius* Bishop of *Helenopolis*; yet it is doubtful, who was the real Author of it: but he was certainly a very zealous *Joannite*.

(f) V. Hanc Epistolam in *Palladio*, p. 10---22.

“ cited,

“ cited, that they would manage the
 “ Trial against him; and that he could
 “ obtain *none* of these Things, but was
 “ driven again from his See (t)”. Which
 seems plainly to imply, that no Synod
 had been actually assembled after John’s
 Restoration, at least, that there had no Sy-
 nod which had taken Cognizance of his
 Cause (u). Ac-

(t) Παρεκαλέσθην βασιλέα σύνοδον συναγαγεῖν εἰς ἐκδικίαν
 τῆς γεννηθείας. Συνεδῶς τοίνυν (Θεόφιλος) ἄπὸρ ἔδρασε. τῶν
 γραμμωμένων βασιλικῶν παντοχόθεν πάντες συναγαγόντων, ἀπί-
 δρα. — Πλὴν ἐδὲ μὲν ταῦτα ἡμεῖς ἡσυχάζομεν. ἀλλ’ ἐπι-
 κείμεθα, ἀξιῶντες δικασθῆσαι γενέσθαι καὶ κρίσιν καὶ δίκην. ἵτοιμγοι
 ὅτι ἡμεῖς διῆξα, ἐαυτοὺς πρὸς ἀνδράσις ὄντας ἐκείνους
 ὅτι πρὸς ἡμᾶς παρενομήσαντες. Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τινες Σύροι
 τῶν τότε μετ’ αὐτῶν παρόντων, ἐνθάδε ἀπληθέστες, οἱ κοινῇ
 μετ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ πᾶν ἐδραματούργησαν καὶ ὥστε τὰς ἵτοιμοὺς ἡμεῖς
 διακρίνειν — καὶ ἐδίδος τῶν ἐτόχων, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἐξώσθη-
 μεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

(u) If any Synod acquitted John, it is strange that Pal-
 ladius should omit a Circumstance, which was so con-
 siderable in it self, and so much to the Advantage of
 his Cause: and it is more strange, that John should
 say, *That he had desired to be tried by a Synod in or-
 der to prove himself innocent, and could not obtain it.*
 At least, if he had said so, he would undoubtedly have
 added; that when his Adversaries would not come to a
 Trial, upon Default of their Appearance, a Synod had
 absolved and restored him without Trial. And therefore
 I am perswaded that Sozomen is mistaken in saying (L. 8.
 C. 19.) *That a Synod of about 60 Bishops met at Con-
 stantinople, and decreed the Proceedings of the Synod
 ad Quercum to be null, and that John should have his
 See.* And I conjecture, that what occasion’d his Mi-
 stake was, that John really spoke something to this
 Effect; that 65 Bishops had, by COMMUNICATING

According then to *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, *Chrysostom* seems to have yielded, that the Synod which condemned him, was more numerous, than that which absolved him. No other ancient Authors mention that he ever alledged, that any Synod had absolved him. So that there is certainly no Account of his ever pleading, that a more numerous Synod had restored him, than that which deposed him.

He undoubtedly pleaded, that he did not return of himself, but by the Emperor's Command. Yet, tho' the Emperor recall'd him from Banishment, it no where appears, that the Emperor commanded that he should be restored to his See: But on the contrary, he immediately sum-

with him, *interpretatively* decreed his Restoration. And *Socrates's* Expression seems to favour this Conjecture. *Sixty five Bishops having COMMUNICATED with him, decreed (his Restoration.)* And *Sozomen* also expresses himself much in the same manner in another Place (*viz. L. 8. c. 20.*) *John pleaded the Decree of those who had COMMUNICATED with him since the former Synod.* And it is very likely that 65 Bishops might have communicated with *John*, and that what *Leontius* said, might also be true in this Sense, *viz. that more than 65 Bishops had in effect decreed John's Deposition, by having broken off Communion with him.* And this is consistent with *Palladius's* Account, (*p. 23, 71*) That the Synod *ad Quercum*, which for-

summon'd a Synod to try the Cause (w), and refused to communicate with *John*, till he was cleared * ; and it is certain, that it was the Importunity of the People, which prevail'd upon *John* to resume his Throne and the Exercise of his Function (x).

He also pleaded, that the first Synod were not qualified to be his Judges, for several Reasons. But what Weight there was in this Plea, is uncertain ; because nothing appears to have been said to shew, that when the Council of *Antioch* decreed that a Bishop unjustly Deposed by a Synod, should not of himself return to his See, they meant this only, of such Synodical Depositions as were unjust, because they were passed for insufficient Causes; and not of such Synodical Depositions as

formally condemned him, consisted but of 36, or at most 43 Bishops.

(w) This appears from *Chrysostom's* Words last quoted.

* *Socrat. L. 6. c. 18.* Δηλοῖ (ὁ βασιλεὺς) τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, ὡς ἔωσπερ αὐτῷ κρινανήσῃ, πρὶν αὖν ὥσπερ ἀποδύηται τῷ ἐγκλήματι.

(x) *Socrat. L. 6. c. 16.* Τὸ πλῆθος παρεκάλεν Ἰωάννην, ἵνα τῷ ἐπισκοπικῷ θρόνῳ καθίστατο, καὶ συνήθως τῷ λαῷ τὴν εἰρήνην ἐπιύξαιτο· ὃ ὁ παραιτηθεὶς ——— ἔγκειτο τὸ πλῆθος, ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν καθήμενον ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ ποθέειν, καὶ πάλιν αὐτῷ διδάσκειν ἀκροῦσθαι· ἐξίχυσεν, ὁ λαὸς ταῦτα κατεργασαμέναι. *Sozomen. L. 8. c. 18.* Παραιτήμενον ἡγάγεσαν (ὁ δὲμος) τὴν εἰρήνην τῷ λαῷ ὥσπερ πίνειν, ὥς εἰς τὸ ἐπισκοπικὸν καθίστασθαι θρόνον.

were unjust, because they were passed by incompetent Synods.

The main Plea, and that on which the *Joannites* finally insisted, was, that the *Antiochian* Council which made that Canon was an *Arian* Council. Now it was rejected on this Pretence by *Athanasius*, as well as by *Chrysostom* and the *Joannites*. But *Valesius* says (*γ*), *Athanasius* could not be a good Witness in his own Cause: And there lies the same Objection against the Testimony of *Chrysostom* and his Adherents. It was also for the same Reason rejected by *Innocent* (*z*), and by the Historians *Socrates* (*a*) and *Sozomen* (*b*). And *Palladius* (*c*) and *Innocent* (*d*) alledge, that it was rejected by the Council of *Sardica*. I suppose, they meant, that the Council of *Sardica* interpretatively rejected it, because they restored *Athanasius*, whom that Council of *Antioch* had Deposed on Pretence of this Canon (*e*).

On the other Hand, it is certain, that many Orthodox Bishops were present at it (*f*). *Palladius* tells us, that those Canons

(*γ*) In Annotationibus ad Socrat. L. 6. c. 18. (*z*) *Vid. Ejus Epistolam apud Sozom. L. 8. c. 26.* (*a*) H. E. L. 6. c. 18. (*b*) L. 8. c. 20. (*c*) P. 78. (*d*) *Ubi Supra.* (*e*) V. Socrat. L. 2. c. 8. (*f*) *Consule Valesii Annor. ad Socrat. L. 6. c. 18.*

were

were made by 40 *Arians* (g); and he, no doubt, would not represent the Number of *Arian* Bishops present at that Council, less than it was. Now, according to *Socrates*, there were 90, and according to *Sozomen* 97 Bishops at that Council (h). And it must be allow'd to have been an Orthodox Council, if most of its Members were Orthodox. And it is also certain, that the Eastern and Western Churches have, since at least, allowed the Authority of this Council; and so has *Valesius* (i) and Mr. *Dodwel*. And Mr. *Collier* seems to be of the same Mind; for he quotes this Canon as good Authority (k). And *Chrysostom* himself insisted, that he ought not to resume the Exercise of his Office, before his Sentence was reversed by a greater Synod (l). *Sozomen* indeed tells us, that his Reason was, *that the Injustice of his former Deposition might be made manifest*. And probably that was one Reason; but if that had been the only one, how came he to urge so often the

(g) P. 78. (h) Soer. L. 2. c. 8. Sozom. L. 3. c. 5. (i) In Annotat. ad Soerat. L. 6. c. 18. & Observat. Ecclesiast. ad Soerat. & Sozom. L. 1. c. 8. (k) E. H. Vol. 2. p. 614. a. (l) Soer. L. 6. c. 16. Οὐ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν ἀπέχεσθαι, ἢ ἐν μείζονι δικαστηρίῳ ἀθωωθῆναι. Sozom. L. 8. c. 18. Πρὸς κρίσεως μείζονος συνόδου.

Necessity of a Synod (*m*), and to insist so particularly, that it should be a *greater* Synod, and should be held *before* his resuming his Throne, since the Justice of his Cause might have appeared, if tried by a Synod of an *equal* Number *after* he had repossessed himself of his See? So that tho' *Chrysostom* might afterward think those Canons to be invalid; yet he seem'd then to be at least doubtful of it, and to be very unwilling to put it to the Hazard, whether they were or no.

Upon the whole then, it is *not certain* but that the second Deposition of *Chrysostom* might be, strictly speaking, Canonical. And if it were Canonical, then, according to the Principles of our Adversaries, the *Joannites* were Schismatics, and consequently our Adversaries too, if they be so exactly like them, as they pretend. Nay, it will appear by and by, that the *Joannites* of *Constantinople* were for disowning *Atticus*, esteemed Schismatics by many, who yet thought *Chrysostom's* Deposition to be unjust. And this is *certain*, that the *Joannites* were in several Instances guilty of great

(*m*) *Sozomen* says the People forced *John* to resume his Throne, παλάτις ἰκνεῖσθαι, ἔπειτα ἀπέστη τὸς καὶ ἐψηφισαὶ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀποψηφισαὶ.

Passion and Irregularity, and not such Persons, as that we can conclude an Action to be Regular, because they did it.

2. Supposing St. *Chrysostom's* Deposition to have been Uncanonical, it is not true, that till his Name was written in the Diptychs, the whole Catholick Church, except a small Party, refused to communicate with *Arsacius*, and with *Atticus* too, till he had written *Chrysostom's* Name in the Diptychs.

Theodoret acquaints us (n), “ that those, “ whom he calls the European Bishops (o), “ testified their Detestation of *John's* unjust Deposition in an extraordinary and “ distinguishing Manner (p). For they broke “ off Communion with his Deposers, i. e. “ as he explains himself, they divided the “ Body of the Church (q). And all the

(n) H. E. L. 5. c. 34. Ταύτην ἰδὼν ἡμεῖς ἀφαιρόμενος τῇ ἀδικίᾳ οἱ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐπίσκοποι. τῶν δὲ τῶν διδρακόντων σφᾶς αὐτὸς ἀπέκρινεν κενωρίας, καὶ Ἰαννοῦ δὲ πάντες τῆς μετέπειτα ἐκείνης ἡμέρας.

(o) *Theodoret* does not say distinctly, whether he speaks of most, or only of a few of the Europeans or Westerns. And I shall hereafter shew, that in all Probability, by the Europeans and Westerns, we ought to understand no more than the Bishops of Italy, and particularly of Rome.

(p) Διαφέροντως. Differently from, or above others.

(q) For *Theodoret* having said, The Europeans broke off Communion with *John's* Deposers, adds, but most of the Easterns did not divide the Body of the Church.

“ If-

"*Illyrians* were of their Party." This implies, that other Bishops did not break off Communion with *John's* Deposers. For, 1. The *Europeans* and *Illyrians* could not have been said to have testify'd their Detestation in a *Distinguishing* Manner, if others had expressed it in the *same* Manner. 2. If any other Body of Bishops, besides the *Illyrians*, had agreed with the *Europeans* in this Point, *Theodoret* would undoubtedly have mentioned them, as well as he does the *Illyrians*. So that this Passage shews, that no College of Bishops, except the *Illyrians*, and those whom *Theodoret* calls the *Europeans*, ever divided from the Deposers of *Chrysostom*, or from *Arsacius*, or *Atticus*, who were principally concerned in his Deposition (r).

And this will appear more certain from the Consideration of the several Colleges or Provinces of Bishops. *Theodoret* says expressly in the Words immediately following those already mentioned : " But M O S T of the " Bishops of the E A S T, tho' they declined communicating in *John's* unjust " Deposition, yet did not divide the Body of the Church (s)". The Bishops

(r) Vid. Photium in Codice 59. Pallad. p. 95. Sozom. L. 8. c. 27.

(s) Τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνίστασθαι πόλεων οἱ πλεῖστοι (ἐπισκοποι) ἔφυγον μὲν τὴν ἀδικίαν τὴν κοινονίαν· τὸ δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅρα ἡμετέριον εἶναι.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 283

of the *East* are here taken in the larger Sense, for the Bishops of the *Eastern*, as it is distinguished from the *Western* Church. For they are here opposed to *European* and *Western* Bishops (t).

And, by the Way, these Bishops, who were at least the Majority of the *Eastern* Church, did, by communicating with the Deposers of *Chrysostom*, when they esteemed his Deposition to be unjust, declare it to be their Judgment, that it was lawful to acknowledge the Successors of a Bishop unjustly Deposed, and that the *Joannites* who lived under such Successors, were Schismatics for disowning them. And *Theodoret* was plainly of the same Opinion. For he calls *the breaking off Communion with those who Deposed him, a Dividing the Body of the Church*. And yet he also thought *John's* Deposition to be unjust. And besides, he was a great Admirer of *Chrysostom*, and wrote after the Affair was all over. And therefore was perhaps prejudiced for the *Joannites*, but could not be prejudiced against them.

(t) *Theodoret* says, in the Words already quoted, "The Europeans did, but the Easterns did not, divide the Body of the Church:" And in the next Words, "That the Westerns did not return to Communion with *John's* Deposers, till his Name was inserted in the Diptychs."

I shall hereafter shew, that the Bishops of *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*, not only communicated with *Chrysoſtom's* Depoſers, but approved of his Depoſition. To theſe we may add all thoſe Bishops, who in the Second Synod voted for confirming the firſt Sentence againſt *Chryſoſtom*, except three, who appear to have been *Egyptian* Bishops (u), and conſequently were reckoned before. How many that Synod conſiſted of, is not certain. But *Palladius* thus informs us (w): *Chryſoſtom's* Adverſaries having called together All the *Metropolitans* and Bishops of *Syria*, and *Capadocia*, and *Pontus*, and *Phrygia*, aſſembled them at *Conſtantinople* — *Theodorus* indeed of *Tyana*, having found out the Plot, left them all, without taking any leave; that he might not follow the Raſhneſs of *Theophilus*. Now, from *Palladius's* telling us, that *Theodorus* left *Conſtantinople*, we may collect, that none of the reſt of thoſe Bishops did leave it; otherwiſe he would have told us of them alſo. That

(u) V. Pallad. p. 76. (w) Ibid. Μεγαλειστάμοις τῶν Συρίας καὶ καππαδοκίας καὶ τῆς Ποντικῆς διοικήσεως ἔ Φρυγίας ὅλους μητροπολίτας καὶ ἐπισκόπους, συναθροίζουσιν εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινέαν. — Καὶ Θεόδωρος μὲν, ὁ Τυανῶν ἐπίσκοπος, συνεῖς τὴν σκεδωρίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαγγελθήσῃ τῇ ὀψιπείρᾳ Θεοφίλου, ἀσυγκύτως κατέλιπεν τὰς πάντας, κ. τ. λ.

Synod then consisted of the Bishops of *Syria, Cappadocia, Pontus* and *Phrygia*, and probably of several others (x). And at least the Majority of them, which could not be a small Number, concurred in Depriving *Chrysostom*. And tho' they are said to have communicated with him upon their coming to *Constantinople* (y): Yet they might well think themselves bound to do so, before they had deposed him, or heard what was objected against him.

Honorius also, in a Letter to *Arcadius*, calls those Bishops who had concur'd in Depriving *Chrysostom* by the Name of the *Eastern* Bishops in general (z); which he would never have done, if there had not been a Number of them. At least, if our Adversaries will insist,

(x) Some are mention'd by Name, as active against *Chrysostom*. For Instance, *Cyrinus* of *Chalcedon*, *Leonius* of *Ancyra*, *Ammonius* of *Laodicea* in *Pisidia*, *Briso*, a *Thracian* Bishop. *Pallad.* p. 77, 78, 79. *Socrat.* H. E. L. 6. c. 18. (y) *Ibid.* p. 77. (z) Pope *Innocent* having laid the Case of *John* before *Honorius*, that Emperor assembled a Synod upon the Occasion; and chose Legates to carry his Letter to *Arcadius*, wherein he thus writes, " Pray give an honourable Reception to those Legates, that if they be convinced, that *John* is justly deposed, they may admonish me to break off Communion with him, " *ἢ ἐλάνθαντες ἐμελοκαχέζετε τὰς τῶν ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους, ἀπερὲς αὐτοῦ ὡς τὸ αὐτῷ προηαινοίας.* *Pallad.* p. 30.

that

that *Honorius*, by the Bishops of the *East*, might mean only a *few* of the *Easterns*; they must grant, that when *Theodoret* says in like manner, that the *Western* or *European* Bishops broke off Communion with *John's* Deposers, it may be understood of only a *few* of the *Westerns*.

Most of the Bishops then of the *Eastern* Church, disapproved of *Chrysostom's* Deposition, and yet communicated with his Deposers. A great *many* of the *Easterns* not only communicated with his Deposers, but concurred in, or at least approved of his Deposition. And if these be joined together, it will appear, that almost *All* the Bishops of the *Eastern* Church always communicated with *Chrysostom's* Deposers, and consequently with the Principal of them, *Arsacius* and *Atticus*. And so they continued to do; and even of those *few* who at first divided, *most*, if not *all*, were by degrees returned to Communion with *Atticus*, before he had inserted *John's* Name into the Diptychs. For when he had shewn that Respect to his deceased Rival, he wrote to St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, to acquaint him with it, and to persuade him to do the like. And in his Letter he observes, " That
" the great Disturbance which had been
" with relation to *Chrysostom*, was laid a-
" sleep,

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 287

“ sleep, and there was an Agreement of
 “ Mind, and a Calm in the Churches through-
 “ out the World (a): That the Populace
 “ of Constantinople happening to hear, that
 “ his Name was written in the Diptychs
 “ of Antioch, were all almost in a Tu-
 “ mult to have the same Respect paid
 “ to him at Constantinople: And that if
 “ they had not been gratified, there
 “ would have been great Danger of
 “ having the Peace broken again, and
 “ the Dissention revived.” Now by the
 World, here cannot be meant less than
 the Eastern Moiety of the Roman Em-
 pire, subject to Arcadius; and there could
 not have been an Agreement in the Church-
 es throughout Arcadius’s Dominions, if
 any Number of them or their Bishops,
 had refused to communicate with At-
 ticus.

Theodoret writes (b), that Alexander Bi-
 shop of Antioch was the first who in-
 serted John’s Name into the Diptychs:
 which

(a) Ἐκεῖνη μὲν (ἡ παρὰ τὴν) κατηνάρουσα ὁμόνοια ἣ καὶ γαλήνη
 κατέχευε πᾶσι κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαις. Attici Epist. in
 Cyrilli Oper. Tom. 5. par. 2. p. 201. & Niceph. Callist.
 H. E. L. 14. c. 26.

(b) H. E. L. 5. c. 35. Ἀλέξανδρος τὴν Ἰωάννη τῷ παν-
 θεωτηρείῳ πρῶτος πᾶσι ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς διπύχαις ἐπέταξε. Chry-
 sostom died the 14th of September, 407. Socrat. L. 6.
 c. 21.

which implies at least, that he was the first Bishop of the *Eastern Church*, who did it; and he did not do it, till near six Years after *John's Death* (b). And about Eleven Years after his Death (b), *St. Cyril*, in his Answer to the above-mentioned Letter to *Atticus*, arguing against shewing this Respect to *John's Memory*, says; *What if Alexander have deceived and drawn SOME Bishops in the EAST to consent to it* (c)? which intimates, not only that *most* of the Bishops in the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, which was strictly called the *East* (d), but also that the Bishops in *other Countries*, had not yet consented. The Bishops then of the *Eastern Church* were so far from rejecting *Arsacius* or *Atticus*, that they did not for a long time so much as admit *John's Name* into the Diptychs.

Thus I have shewn in *general*, that almost All the Bishops of the *Eastern*

c. 21. *Alexander* received his Name into the Diptychs in the Year 413, and *Atticus* in 418, according to *Du Pin*, in his Account of *Chrysostom*.

(c) Εἰ γὰρ εἴ πως ἔκαστος τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑσθλὴν συνεπισκόπων Ἀλέξανδρον πεινάει καὶ συναρπάσας εἶλιν εἰς τὴν ἐπὶ τούτῳ συναίεσιν;

(d) Can. 2. OEcum. Concil. Constant. Τὸς δὲ τῶν Ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπων τὴν Ἀνατολὴν μόνον διοικεῖν φυλαττομένων ἔστω τοῖς κατέστι τοῖς κατὰ Νίκαιαν πρεσβυτέρων τῇ Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

Church

Church acknowledged *Atticus*, before he had written *John's* Name in the Dip-tychs. And if we descend also to *Particulars*, it will be still more plain, that there is Reason to except but a very few out of that Number. The *Eastern* Church was divided into Four *Patriarchates* under the *Patriarchs* (e) of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*, or *Cæsarea*. *Constantinople* was the See in Dispute: And our Adversaries would persuade us, that the *Catholicks* of that *Patriarchate* did not acknowledge *Atticus*. But *Palladius* confesses, that *Theophilus* at the very Beginning turned the Majority of the Clergy against *John* (f). And *Theodoret* tells us (g), “ When *Chrysostom* was dead, the *Western* Bishops did not join in Communion with the Bishops of *Egypt*, the *East*, *Bosporus* and *Thrace*,

(e) So I shall take the Liberty to call them, for Distinction-sake; tho' the Terms *Patriarch* and *Patriarchate*, do not seem to have been in common Use in *Chrysostom's* Time.

(f) Μετεκέρχθη πρὸς τὸ κρατύνειν γνώμας, ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀγασπίδας τὰς πλείονας τῶ κλήρῳ. *Pallad.* p. 67.

(g) H. E. L. 5. c. 34. Τελούτησαν οὖν τῷ μεγάλῳ διδασκαλῷ τὸ οἰκονομῆναι, καὶ ἀπέπεσαν οἱ τῆς Ἑσπίας ἐπίσκοποι τὸ ἐν Ἀνγύλῳ καὶ τῇ Ἑλλάδι τὸ ἐν τῷ Βοσπόρῳ καὶ τῇ Θράκῃ τὴν ἡσπιομένην ἰσχυροῦντο, ἕως ἐκείνῃ τῷ ἡσπιομένῳ ἀνδρὶ τένοντο πρὸς πεινῶσιν ἐπισκόποις συνέλθαι. The *East* is here taken strictly for the *Patriarchate* of *Antioch*. For it is distinguished from *Egypt* and *Thrace* which were Parts of the *East* taken in the larger Sense.

U

“ till

“ till they had Register'd his Name among Bishops deceased.” *Bosporus* and *Thrace* were subject to the Patriarch of *Constantinople* (*h*) ; and this Passage shews, that the Bishops of *Bosporus*, *Thrace*, *Egypt*, and of the *East*, strictly so called, were so far from disowning *Atticus*, that they did not at first admit *Chrysostom*'s Name into the Diptychs, and were therefore excommunicated by the *Westerns*.

The Bishops also of *Pontus*, *Cappadocia* and *Phrygia* were subject to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. And I have before observed, that these Bishops among others, composed that second Synod, which confirmed *Chrysostom*'s Deposition ; and consequently we may well conclude, that at least the Generality of them readily acknowledged *Atticus*.

St. *Cyril*, in his Answer to the above-mentioned Letter of *Atticus*, writes to this Effect ; “ That tho' some had in the beginning been contentious, and dissenting from *Atticus* ; yet it was now a long time since none had refused to join in Communion with him, particularly not one of the Magistrates ; that therefore he could recover none to the Church by

(*h*) *Can.* 28. *Q*Ecumen. *C*oncil. *Chalced.* Τὸς τὸ Ποντικῆς ἔ τ' Ἀσιατικῆς καὶ τῆς Θρακικῆς διοικήσεως μητροπολίτας χηροβριέμεται ἐπὶ τῷ ἴσῳ τ' κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἐκκλησίᾳ.
“ in-

" inserting *Chrysostom's* Name into the
 " Diptychs, since all were already come
 " over ; but that thereby he would grieve
 " all *Egypt*, and the Region of *Augusta*,
 " and *Arcadia*, and *Thebais*, and *Lybia*,
 " and *Pentapolis*, and so many Churches (i).
 Now the very least that *Cyril* could mean
 in this Passage, must be, that there were
 then none to speak of in the Patriarchate
 of *Atticus*, who divided from him ; but
 probably he meant, that at that Time
 none, in comparison, throughout the
Eastern Church dissented. For if they
 had, the Recovering them to the Church
 would as well have been a Compensation
 for offending the *Egyptians*, as the recover-
 ing those of the Patriarchate of *Constan-*
tinople.

As to *Alexandria*, *Theophilus* Bishop
 thereof was, as has already been obser-

(i) Τοσούτῳ ἤδη διπτιύῳ χροῖον τῇ σῆς Θεοσεβείας δια-
 πύσης τῇ ἱστορίᾳ, καὶ ἐδίδετο ἐπὶ τὸ συνάγαγαν παραιτέμεθα.
 Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πρὶν πρὸς τὴν ὁρχὴν φιλονεικόμενοι σεβασίοντες
 ἑαυτοὺς ἀπικρίνοντο, καὶ ἔτι κέκληνται ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡ-
 μῶν ἰσχύειν πρὸς χάριν. Τῶν ὅντων τίς ὁ μὴ τῇ σῆς εὐλα-
 βείας ἀκροώμενος ; τίς ὁ παύτης ἕνεκα τῆς αἰτίας ἕξω με-
 μνημένος ; οὐκ ἔστιν ἐδίδετο μὴ ἢ διὰ τὸν Θεόν. τίνα τιμαρῶν ἀνα-
 σῶζων, ἢ εἰς τὸ συνάγαγαν καλῶν, ὅλην ἕξω θείας τῆς ἐκκλησίας
 ἀποδόλων, τὴν περὶ Ἀιγύπτου καὶ Ἀφρικανίαν, καὶ Ἀρκαδίαν καὶ
 Θεβαϊδαν καὶ Λιβύαν, καὶ Πεντάπολιν, καὶ ποσύντας ἐκκλησίας
 λυπῶν ; ἵνα μηδὲν κερδάνης παύσας ἢ ἀποκρίναι τῇ σω-
 τηρίᾳ ἡ χάρις.

ved, the Leader of those who Deposed *Chrysostom*; and his Successor *Cyril*, appears from the Passage just mentioned, to have communicated with *Atticus*, and to have opposed the enrolling *Chrysostom's* Name among deceased Bishops. Thirty Six, or at least Twenty Nine *Egyptian* Bishops concur'd with *Theophilus* in condemning *Chrysostom*, as we learn from *Palladius* (k), who undoubtedly did not magnify the Number. And *Cyril* plainly tells us, that all *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*, i. e. all the Churches subject to

(k) *Palladius* says, p. 23. *Theophilus* sent to *Innocent* the *Acts* of the Synod *ad Quercum*, ἐν οἷς ἐδόξε καὶ ἀπε-
κρίσθαι ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ Θεὸς τεράκοντα καὶ ἐπισκέπων, ὧν οἱ μὲν εἰκο-
σιεννία ἦσαν Αἰγυπτῖοι, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἄλλων κλιμάτῳ. But, p. 71.
he relates, that Forty Bishops, who were Friends of *John*, and present at *Constantinople* when that Synod
sate, sent a Message to *Theophilus*, that they had a
much better Pretence to try him, than he to try *John*.
For, say they, you are *Thirty six* of one Province, i. e.
undoubtedly the Province of *Alexandria*: Σὺ μὲν γὰρ εἰς
τεράκοντες ἐκὶ καὶ ἐπαρχίας μιᾶς: But we are *Forty* of
different Provinces. And if to these *Thirty six Egyptian*
tians, we add the abovemention'd Seven Bishops of other
Provinces, we shall find this latter Account to agree best
with the *Acts* of the Synod *Apud Photium in Cod. 59*,
which represent the Members thereof to have been in all
Forty five. And these Accounts may be reconciled with
one another, if we suppose, that the Seven Bishops of
other Provinces happened not to be present at that par-
ticular Session, when the aforesaid Message was sent,
and that Seven of the *Egyptian* Bishops did not, on some
Account or other, sign the *Acts* of this Synod.

the

the See of *Alexandria* (l) would be greatly offended with the bare Insertion of *Chrysostom's* Name into the Diptychs. And this Account of *Cyril* is confirmed by the abovementioned Passage of *Theodoret*, wherein he relates, that the *Western* Bishops would not communicate with the Bishops of *Egypt*, till they had admitted *John* into the Register of Bishops deceased. But perhaps when our Adversaries yielded, that *Atticus* was acknowledged by the *small Alexandrian Party*, they understood thereby all the Bishops subject to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*: yet then even they alone were not a *small Party*, being about one Hundred in Number (m).

I have already observed, that the Patriarchate of *Antioch* in *Syria* contained under it, not only the Churches of *Syria*, but of all the *Eastern* Province of the *Roman* Empire, strictly so called. Now *Porphyrius* Patriarch of *Antioch* was one of *Chrysostom's* principal Adversaries: And so were some other Bishops of *Sy-*

(l) Concil. Nicæni, Can. 6. Τα ἀρχαῖα ἔη κρατεῖτω, καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὅστ' ἔ' Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοποι πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

(m) Athanas. Vol. i. p. 788. Edit. Paris, 1627. Ἐπίσκοποι εἰσιν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει ἑγγυὲς ἑκατὸν. Confer. p. 692. & Socrat. H. E. L. i. c. 6.

ria (n). And I have also proved that the Bishops of *Syria* were Members of that second Synod, which confirmed the Deposition of *Chrysostom*. So that we may well conclude, that the Majority at least of the Bishops of *Syria* did from the beginning not only communicate with *Chrysostom*'s Deposers, but approve of his Deposition. I have likewise shewn out of *Theodoret*, that the *Western* Bishops refused to communicate with the Bishops of the *East*, strictly so called, till they had enroll'd *John* in their Diptychs; and that *Alexander* Bishop of *Antioch* was the first who complied with the *Westerns* in that Point; both which Passages necessarily prove, that not only the Bishops of *Syria*, but also the other Bishops subject to the Patriarch of *Antioch*, did not at first so much as write *John*'s Name in the Diptychs. Nay, when *Alexander* had paid this Honour to *Chrysostom*; *Cyril* implies, as I before observed, that he drew only a few Bishops of the *East*, strictly so called, to join with him. And shortly after, *John*'s Name was again struck out of the Diptychs of *Antioch*. For we learn from the abovemention'd Let-

(n) *Vid.* Pallad. p. 97.

ters of *Atticus* and *Cyril* (o), that *Theodotus*, the Successor of *Alexander*, had been by the People forced against his Will to write *John's* Name in the Diptychs ; which plainly shews, that it had been again expunged.

As to the Fourth Division of the *Eastern Church*. *St. Chrysostom* writing from *Caucusus* to *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem* exhorts him, " That as he had from the " Beginning shewn great Courage in Ex- " communicating those who had disturb- " ed the Church ; so he would now pre- " serve the same Courage, and Excom- " municate those who had raised such a " Storm throughout almost the whole " World (p). This Bishop of *Jerusalem* had engaged so warmly in Defence of *Origen*, as to excommunicate *St. Jerom*, who had censured *Origen* ; and *St. Chrysostom* had

(o) Γέγραπεν ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς ἑσῆς Ἀκακίας, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς Ἀντιοχείας Θεόδοτον συναναγκασθῆναι ὡς καὶ τὸ δῆμον τὴν καθολοσίαν Ἰωάννην γράψαι. *Attici Epist.* and *St. Cyril* in his Answer speaks to the same Purpose.

(p) Παρεκαλύψατε ὑμῶν τὴν εὐλάβειαν, τὴν ἀνδρείαν, ἣν ἐξαρχῆς ἐπιδείξατε, ἀποστρέφοντες τὰς πρὸς ἐκκλησίας ποσῶν δορυδῶν ἐμπλήσαντας, πύτην καὶ νῦν ἀγασθῆναι καὶ ὅσον μικρὰς ὑμῶν ἐβλήθη κείσθαι ὁ μισθὸς, ὅταν τὰς ποσῶν χειμῶνας ἐργαστηρίους, καὶ τὴν οἰκὸν ἡμετέραν ἀπὸ τῶν ποσῶν ἐμπλήσαντας σκαυδαλῶν, ὡς ἀποσπῶν ἐσιν ὑμῶν, ἀποστρέφοντες καὶ μηδὲν κρινόντες ἔχητε πρὸς αὐτούς. Et infra, πρὸς ἐκκλησίας ἀσφαλίζετε τὰς πρὸς τὸν πόπῳ. *Epist.* 126. *Edit. Savil.*

so far seconded him in this Cause, as to receive kindly some Monks, whom *Theophilus* had expelled out of *Egypt* for favouring *Origen*. In the first part of the Letter St. *Chrysostom* probably alludes to this Excommunication of St. *Jerom*; and in the latter part he evidently means his own Case. For there was no other thing at that time, which disturbed the whole Church. Now from his desiring this Bishop to Excommunicate his Adversaries, it manifestly follows, that he had not yet Excommunicated them; and it is not probable, that he afterward did. I suppose indeed that he was not active *against Chrysostom*, because we hear nothing of it, and he was then one of the most considerable Men in the Christian Church; and we have a particular Account what Part he acted, when he exerted himself upon other Occasions. And for the same Reasons, I conclude much more strongly, that he did not declare *for Chrysostom*. For if he had, it would certainly have been related by the Ecclesiastical Historians, who had all an Esteem for *Chrysostom*, and especially by *Palladius*, who appears to have been so far from willingly omitting Bishops of Note, that he gives us a particular Account of several
Presby-

Presbyters and Deacons, who refused to communicate with *Atticus* (q).

Chrysostom also, in another Epistle from *Cucusus* to *Eulogius*, Bishop of *Cesarea* in *Palestine*, writes to this Effect: "Tho' I
 " am banish'd to such a desert Place,
 " I have not forgot your Love; but de-
 " clare to All that steadiness of Mind,
 " which you shew'd against those who
 " assaulted the Church, and filled the
 " World with so many Offences; and
 " which you made by your Deeds to
 " sound out louder than a Trumpet to
 " all the *East*, and to those who are at
 " the greatest Distance: For which I
 " thank and commend you (r). Our
 Adversaries may be apt to imagine that
 hereby is understood the Steadiness which
Eulogius shewed in espousing *Chrysostom's*
 present Cause. But upon Examination
 they will find it otherwise. For *Chryso-*
stom goes on thus: " I exhort you to
 " shew still the same Zeal. For it is
 " not the same thing to preserve ones
 " Integrity in a State of Prosperity; as
 " it is not to be seduced when the
 " Church has many Enemies, but to con-

(q) Pallad. p. 196.

(r) *Epist.* *Chrysostomi* 91.

“ tinue to express our Abhorrence of
 “ them with due Magnanimity (f) ”.

Probably *Eulogius* had formerly joined with *Chrysostom* against *Theophilus*, in favour of *Origen*, or on some other Occasion in that long Difference which had been between *Theophilus* and *Chrysostom* (t). But whatever the Cause were in which *Eulogius* had so much exerted himself, it was undoubtedly different from that Cause in which *Chrysostom* was then embarrassed, tho’ some of the Parties engaged in both these Causes were probably the same. For according to this Epistle, in the former Cause he was in Prosperity, and had few Enemies; and there was little or no Danger in appearing his Friend. In the latter Cause he had many and powerful Enemies, and a Man must be endued with Resolution and Courage to adhere steadily to his Party. So that it only appears from this Letter, that *Chrysostom*

(f) Παρακαλῶντες τὸ αὐτὸν παρεμῖναν ζῆλοι ἐπιδοκινούμενοι, εἰδὲν ὅτι ἴσμεν ἐπὶ κατὰ ῥῆν τὴν πραγματικὴν φερόμεν ἐρδότην ἐπιδοκινῶντα, καὶ πολλῶν ὄντων τὴν ἐπιχειρῶντων καὶ ἀλῶσαι πρὸς ἐκκλησίας μηδὲν ἐκείθεν παραλογίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μῦθεν ἀκλινῆ τέττες ἀποστροφόμενοι μετὰ ἀρεσκείας ἀνδρείας.

(t) *Theophilus* had entertain’d an Enmity against *Chrysostom* from the Time of his Promotion to the See of *Constantinople*, because *Theophilus* was desirous to have obtained that See for his own Presbyter *Isidorus*. *Vid.* Socrat. L. 6. c. 2, 5. Pallad. p. 43, 44, 45.

desired *Eulogius* to stick by him in *this*, as he had done in a former Cause: but not that *Eulogius* complied with his Desire.

But supposing *Eulogius* to have declared for *Chrysostom* on his former Deposition, yet it is plain that he was not influenced by this Epistle to adhere to him on his second Deposition. On the contrary, he communicated with *Theophilus*, and is represented by *Palladius*, as one of those who would not shew common Civility to the *Joannites*, but expelled them out of the Cities (u).

And we have reason to conclude from this very Epistle of *Chrysostom*, that the rest of the Bishops of *Palestine* did not break off Communion with *Atticus*. For in the Close *Chrysostom* says thus: "No one can doubt but that if you break off Communion with my Adversaries, all the Bishops of *Palestine* will follow your Steps. For I certainly know, that by your endearing and affectionate

(u) Pallad. p. 200. Εἰς ποσούτων δὲ ἀμύνηται αἱ καὶ τόπων ἡκιστα ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κρινονικῶν Θεοφίλου κατὰ τὴν ἀνατολὴν πᾶσαι, ὡς ἔλεγον ὁ ἔλθων ἀσκητὴς, ὡς πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐχρὶ μόνον μὴ εὐδεξάμενος τὴν ὑφειλομένην συμφροσύνην, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ δάδων πείθει τὰς ἐπαρχικὰς τάξεις ἐξελάνειν ἢ πόλιν. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ μάλιστα τῶτο πεισυνόμενοι, ὁ Ταρσὺς, καὶ ὁ Ἀντιοχείας, καὶ Ἐφέσου ἡ Καισαρείας τῆς Παλαιστίνης.

“ Behaviour, they are as closely tied and
 “ united to you in such good Actions, as
 “ the Body is to the Head (w). Now
 since *Eulogius* had so great an Influence
 upon the Bishops of *Palestine*, we may as
 surely gather, that they did follow his
 Example in acknowledging *Arsacius* and
Atticus, as *Chrysostom* infer’d, that they
 would have follow’d it, if he had disown-
 ed them.

To put the Matter beyond all Dispute,
 I shall conclude with the Testimony of
Chrysostom himself, whose Authority can-
 not be questioned in this Point. In an
 Epistle to Bishop *Mares* *, he thus ex-
 presses himself; “ I highly commend and
 “ admire you, because when *Most* run
 “ themselves headlong into Ruin by tref-
 “ passing against the Church, you went

(w) Ὅτι ἡ τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας ἔτι Διχαρμένης, πάντες οἱ
 κατὰ τὴν Παλαιστίνην ἐπίσκοποι ἔψοιται σε τοῖς ἰχνισι εὐδὲν
 οἶμα διὰ ἀμφιδόξαν. Οἶδα γὰρ σαφῶς, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις
 κατεβήμασιν, ὡς περὶ σῶμα συνεχὲς κεφαλῇ, ἔτι αὐτὸς τῇ
 γλυκύτητι σε τῆς ἀγάπης συνῆψας καὶ συνδιδοῦσα περισκέυ-
 αυτες

* Epist. 112. Καὶ μακαρίζομαι καὶ θαυμάζομαι, ὅτι ἡ
 πλειόνων ἑαυτὸς κατὰ κληρονομίαν τοῖς εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας παρη-
 νόμησιν, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐναντίαν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἡλικίαν ὁδὸν, τὴν πρὸς ταῦτα
 τοῖς μέγιστον δόξαν φέρουσαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοφίας ἀρετῆς μέγαν ἐλ-
 θενταῖ. ἐνοῶν τοίνυν, ἡλικίαν τὴν κατεβήμασιν, τοῦτο τὸ μέγα-
 ρον, καὶ τὸ μὴ καταπαχθῆναι τοῖς ποικιλοτρόποις, εἶναι γυναικίως
 παρακλήθη.

“ a Way contrary to others, both excom-
“ municating those who committed those
“ Things, and continuing in that Liber-
“ ty which becomes you. Considering
“ therefore, how great and glorious it
“ is, to behave your self so well, and
“ not to be carried away with the Wick-
“ ed, be persuaded to persevere with
“ Bravery.”

The Word *μελειους*, properly signifies,
as I translate it, *Most*. And tho' it be
sometimes used in a looser Sense; yet
in this Passage it signifies strictly, as
appears from the whole Tenour of this
Epistle. For *Chrysostom* would have had
no Reason to have commended *Mares* so
highly, nor to have admired him so
much, for going in the Way he did, if
the Majority had gone the same Way:
Nor could he have called it a great
Action in *Mares*, not to be carried a-
way by the Wicked, if those Wicked
had been only a few.

Thus I have shewn both in general,
and as to particular Patriarchates, that
almost all the Bishops of the *Eastern*
Church acknowledged *Chrysostom's* Suc-
cessors, before his Name was inserted in
the Diptychs. And this is as full a Proof
as could have been expected. Nay, it
is strange, that such a Matter should hap-
pen

“ Behaviour, they are as closely tied and
 “ united to you in such good Actions, as
 “ the Body is to the Head (w). Now
 since *Eulogius* had so great an Influence
 upon the Bishops of *Palestine*, we may as
 surely gather, that they did follow his
 Example in acknowledging *Arsacius* and
Atticus, as *Chrysostom* infer’d, that they
 would have follow’d it, if he had disown-
 ed them.

To put the Matter beyond all Dispute,
 I shall conclude with the Testimony of
Chrysostom himself, whose Authority can-
 not be questioned in this Point. In an
 Epistle to Bishop *Mares* *, he thus ex-
 presses himself; “ I highly commend and
 “ admire you, because when *Most* run
 “ themselves headlong into Ruin by tref-
 “ passing against the Church, you went

(w) “Οπ δ̄ τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας ἔγω Αἰγχερίτης, πάντες οἱ
 κατὰ τὴν Παλαιστίνην ἐπίσκοποι ἔχονται σε τοῖς ἰχνισι ἐδίνα
 οἶμαί δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀμφιβάλλειν. Οἶδα γὰρ σφῶς, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοιαῖσι
 καταρθώμασι, ὡςπερ σῶμα συνεχὲς κεφαλῇ, ἔτως αὐτὸς τῇ
 γλυκύτητι σε τῆς ἀγάπης συνῆψας καὶ συνδιδόντα περισκύν-
 ους.

* Epist. 112. Καὶ μεκαρίζομαι καὶ θαυμάζομαι, ὅτι ἔ-
 παύσῃων ἑαυτὸς καὶ ἀκρεμονισάντων οἷς εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας παρε-
 νόμησαν. αὐτὸς τὴν ἐναντίαν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἡλθες ὀδῶν, τὴν τι τοῦτοι
 τοῖς μήτιναι ἀπεριφόρῳ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σὺν ἀρετῆς ἀφ’ ὧν ἰδο-
 θῆναι. ἐνὸς τοῖν, ἡλίκοι τῷ καταρθώματι. τοῦτο τὸ μέγα-
 θον, καὶ τὸ μη ζυγαπαχθῆναι τοῖς ποιερόμενοις, εἶναι γενναίως
 παρὰ κλήρη.

“ a Way contrary to others, both excom-
“ municating those who committed those
“ Things, and continuing in that Liber-
“ ty which becomes you. Considering
“ therefore, how great and glorious it
“ is, to behave your self so well, and
“ not to be carried away with the Wick-
“ ed, be persuaded to persevere with
“ Bravery.”

The Word *ωλετορος*, properly signifies, as I translate it, *Most*. And tho' it be sometimes used in a looser Sense; yet in this Passage it signifies strictly, as appears from the whole Tenour of this Epistle. For *Chrysostom* would have had no Reason to have commended *Mares* so highly, nor to have admired him so much, for going in the Way he did, if the Majority had gone the same Way: Nor could he have called it a great Action in *Mares*, not to be carried away by the Wicked, if those Wicked had been only a few.

Thus I have shewn both in general, and as to particular Patriarchates, that almost all the Bishops of the *Eastern* Church acknowledged *Chrysostom's* Successors, before his Name was inserted in the Diptychs. And this is as full a Proof as could have been expected. Nay, it is strange, that such a Matter should hap-
pen

pen to be capable of so particular a Proof. But to this our Adversaries make one Reply, and but one that I know of, *viz.*

That *Palladius* says, "None of the Eastern Bishops, nor of the People of Constantinople communicated with *Atticus*."

Ans. 1. If this were granted, it would not come up to the Point. For *Palladius* wrote his History indeed after *St. Chrysostom's* Death, but not long after. For he certainly wrote it, while *Theophilus* was living (x); and in all Probability about Four Years after *Chrysostom's* second Banishment (y): *i. e.* within a Year after his Death (z). Now we may sup-

(x) *Pallad.* p. 214. Ἰωάννης ἕως θανάτου ἐ συνεδῶκε τὴν παύρησιαν. ὁ δὲ σκοπὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων οὗτός ἐστιν ἕως τέλους μὴ κοινωνῆσαι τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς ἐπισκόποις, μάλιστα Θεοφίλου.

(y) For some of the *Joannites* were confined at the Time of *John's* second Banishment, (*Pallad.* p. 93. *Soz.* L. 8. c. 22.) and *Palladius*, representing the great and long Sufferings which several of them had undergone, takes Notice of some who had been imprisoned a shorter Time; but the most that he says is, that one of them had been imprisoned Four Years, reckoning to the time of his writing. (Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ἐφῆσιος ἐν τῇ ἐκτετῇ τῆς Νικομηδείας ἐγκλίσειται, περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ λόγος. *Pallad.* p. 195. *conf.* p. 139.) And he was not inclined to extenuate Matters, but if any one had suffered longer, would certainly have told us of it. And therefore *Bigotius*, in his Preface to *Palladius* concludes, that he wrote in the Year 408.

(z) For *John* was carried the second Time into Banishment 20 June, 404. and died 14 Sept. 407. *Socr.* L. 6. c. 18 and 21.

pose

pose, that the same Men might disown *Atticus* before *Chrysostom's* Death, who might upon Consideration acknowledge him some Time after his Death. And consequently it might have been true, both that when *Palladius* wrote, none of the *Eastern* Bishops acknowledged *Atticus*; and that they universally acknowledged him when *Atticus* and *Cyril* wrote the abovementioned Letters, which was many Years afterward. But,

2. The Account *Palladius* gives (a), is this: "*Arfacius* was succeeded by *Atticus*, who perceiving that none of the *Eastern* Bishops, nor of the People of *Constantinople* communicated with him, procures an Edict, that whatsoever Bishop would not communicate with *Theophilus*, and *Porphyrius*, and *Atticus*, he should be Ejected out of his Church, and forfeit his Goods.

Now, not to repeat here, what I have already proved from other undoubted Authorities, *Palladius* himself acquaints us, that the Bishops of *Syria* were Members of that second Council which condemned *Chrysostom*: And that some of the Bishops of the Patriarchate of *Antioch* were the

(a) Pag. 95.

principal Persecutors of *Chrysostom*, and he particularly names *Acacius* of *Beræa*, *Severianus* of *Gabala*, and *Antiochus* of *Ptolemais* (b). And this very *Edict* shews, that *Porphyrus* himself, the Patriarch of *Antioch*, communicated with *Atticus*. So that it was never true, that none of the *Eastern Bishops* communicated with *Atticus*, tho' we should put the most favourable Sense upon the Words, and understand by *Eastern Bishops*, only those of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*. And all which we can certainly collect from this Passage is, that *Palladius's* Zeal for his Cause, made him sometimes so forgetful, as to contradict himself and the Truth, and that therefore we ought to make great Allowances, when we read his History.

3. Supposing that All the *Eastern Bishops* had disowned *Atticus*, till he had obtained that *Edict*, it does not follow but that they might acknowledge him afterward. And *Palladius* himself acquaints us in the following Words, that many of them did. For he says, (c) that upon

(b) *Pallad.* p. 17, 25, 35, 39, 81, 88, 97.

(c) *Pag.* 95. 'Επιϑέν οι μὲν καταβαρυνόμενοι τῷ ᾧ παραμύθῳ φερτοῖ, καὶ ἀκούτες κοινοῦντο· οἱ δὲ πρῶτοι καὶ εἰς πίστιν ὑγιὲς ἀδελφεοὶ, ὑποχρίσασθαι δέον τοῦ συνεσθῆναι εἰς κοινωσίαν.

publishing this Edict, the Bishops who were burthened with Wealth, communicated with Atticus to preserve it; and the Bishops who were poorer, and (as one might expect Palladius would represent those who had deserted his Party) weaker in Faith, communicated with him upon Promise of Gifts. And considering that the Generality of the Eastern Bishops never divided from Atticus, as I have before shewn; and that Palladius here says, that of those who had once divided from him, several rich Bishops and several poor ones acknowledged him on Account of this Edict; we may conclude from this very Passage, that there were but few Bishops who did not own Atticus before, or upon the Publication of this Edict, and some time before Chrysostom died.

But our Adversaries perhaps will urge, that Palladius does not only relate, that several Bishops submitted, but also that several fled; and that these could not be few, because some are said to have fled to Rome, some to the Mountains, and some to Monasteries (d).

To which I answer, that I am persuaded, they could not be many, because

(d) V. Palladium, *ibid.*

if they had, *Palladius* would have told us so. Nay, I am certain even from *Palladius* himself, that there were but *very few Eastern Bishops*, who did not obey this Edict, either *before* or presently after *Chrysostom's* Death, and long before the Admission of his Name into the Diptychs. For in another place (e), where he gives an Account of the Estate of the *Joannite* Bishops after *John's* Death (f), he reckons up by Name seventeen Bishops of several Patriarchates, who still adhered to *John*, and relates general Reports concerning some of them, as well as what he certainly knew of others of them. He tells us, that *several* of them were banished to, and confined in such particular Castles : and that *others* of them were concealed, or lived privately in such particular Places ; and that *others* of them were reported to be retreated to such Countries (g). And then he proceeds, “ But the rest of the Bishops who communicated with *John*, some of them think-

(e) Viz. p. 194, &c.

(f) For there he relates that one of them, *Heraclidas*, had been confined Four Years. Now *John* did not live four Years after his Second Banishment. Vid. Note z, p. 302.

(g) Τυρόθεν ὁ Μαρκεῖας, καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ τ' Αὐδίας, λίγεται ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ. Γρηγόριος ὁ τ' Αὐδίας λίγεται ἐν Φρυγίᾳ. — Λαμπρίνιος δὲ, ὡς φαίνεται, ἐν χειρὶ Αὐδίας τοῖς ἀναγνώσκειν ἀποστέχει.

“ ing Affairs to be desperate, have com-
 “ municated with *Atticus*, and are tran-
 “ slated to other Churches in *Thrace*; and
 “ of *some* of them it is not known where
 “ they be. But they say, that *Anatolius*
 “ is in *Gaul*.” (b). To this he subjoins
 an Account of several *Joannite* Presbyters
 and Deacons by Name; and is so parti-
 cular, as to some of them also, as to relate
 the Countries, whither they were reported
 to be fled. And after them he adds, that
Bishop Silvanus lived at Troas by Fishing
 (i): as if he had forgotten him before,
 and chose to bring him in out of his pro-
 per Place, rather than not to name him
 at all.

From hence I observe, 1. That *Palla-
 dius* here gives us an Account of another
 Part of the *Joannite* Bishops coming over to
Atticus. He had before told us, that up-
 on *Atticus*’s procuring an Edict, that the
Bishops who would not communicate with him,
should be cast out of their Sees, several Bi-
 shops complied to save or to gain, and
 consequently preserved their Bishopricks.

(b) Οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τῶν χριτωνικῶν ἐπισκόπων, οἱ μὲν ἀνέλπισται
 ἐσθνημένους, ἀκοινοῦνται Ἀπικῶ. εἰς ἱστορίας μεσσηγιῶν ἐκκλη-
 σίας τῆς Θερμακίας· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι εἰσιν Ἀνατόλιον ὃ φασὶ εἶναι ἐν
 Γαλλίαις.

(i) Pag. 196.

Here he acquaints us, that several who had not complied with that Edict, but had for adhering to *John*, been cast out of their Sees, did, upon perceiving the Cause to be desperate, *i. e.* undoubtedly upon *John's* Death, or sooner, communicate with *Atticus*, and were set over other Dioceses, probably because their own had been filled. Since then the Generality of the *Eastern* Bishops always acknowledged *Atticus*; and since of those who at first disowned him, several Bishops at different Times, came over to him long before the Registring *John's* Name in the Diptychs: We may conclude in general, that very few persevered in rejecting *Atticus*.

2. I observe, that in this Passage *Palladius* appears plainly to have given us as exactly as he could, the particular Names of all those Bishops who continued to adhere to *John*, of whom he knew any thing where they were; tho' he only knew in general to what Countries they were retreated, and tho' he knew this too, barely by the Report of common Fame. Now *Palladius* was thoroughly acquainted with all the Affairs of the *Joannites*: and therefore we may well conclude, that there could be few, or rather no *Joannite* Bishops, of whom he did not know so much as the Country where they were reported

ported to be. And I am persuaded from his general manner of Writing, and particularly from this Account of the *Joannite* Bishops, that if he could have recollected any more Bishops who adhered to *John*, he would have named them, tho' he could have told nothing of them but their Names.

About the Time then of *Chrysostom's* Death, there continued to adhere to the *Joannites* Nineteen *Eastern* Bishops, besides those of whom *Palladius* could give no Account. If we should therefore admit *Palladius's* State of this Matter, and should grant, that at that Time there were about Twenty *Joannite* Bishops in all; yet this would be a Number not to be named with those *Hundreds* of Bishops who composed the *Eastern* Church. And we may well suppose, that several even of these Twenty might soon after comply with *Atticus* upon Reflection, that the Case was altered by *John's* Death, and that to acknowledge *Atticus* then, was not to disown *John*; as we know Mr. *Dodwel* and other Nonjurors lately acknowledged our Bishops upon like Considerations.

Answ. 4. *Chrysostom* refused to submit to the first Synod, because they were chiefly *Egyptian* Bishops, and had no Authority out

of their Districts (*k*): And for the same Reason probably it was, that *Elpidius* afterward denied, that *Chrysostom* had been Synodically deposed (*l*). Since then the *Joannite* Bishops would not submit to that Synod, because in their Opinion it had no Authority; and since, as *Palladius* acquaints us, many of them did submit, when commanded by the Emperor: we may conclude, that they submitted, because they believed that the Emperor had Authority in this Matter, tho' they thought that Synod had none. And so our Adversaries have introduced an Instance of several Bishops, who acquiesced in the Emperor's Authority, tho' they would not allow the Authority of a pretended Synod. *Palladius* indeed alledges another Reason for their Submission, *viz.* that the Rich Bishops complied to save, and the Poor to gain. But this is a general Asperision without any Proof; and one might well expect, that *Palladius* should not speak very favourably of those whom he esteemed Deserters.

(*k*) *Chrysostom* speaking of *Theophilus*, says, Οὐκ ἔδωκεν ἡν πρὸς Αἰγύπτου εἰς Ὁράκων διακρίσειν. *Vid. Epist. Chrysost. apud Palladium, p. 14.*

(*l*) Οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὸ πρὸς πρὸς καθήκοντα, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκεν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας. *Pallad. p. 79.*

That

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 311

That the Church of *Africa* did not reject *Atticus* we may collect from their first Canon, which was made by a Council held at *Carthage* under *Aurelius*, in *June 407*, which was some time before *John's* Death (m). The Title of this Canon is, *Concerning the making Peace between the Churches of Rome and Alexandria* (n). *Theophilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria* was, as I before observed, the chief Leader of the first Synod which Deprived *Chrysostom*, and therefore *Innocent* Bishop of *Rome*, principally differed with him. Now if the *Africans* had also differed with him, the Title of the Canon would undoubtedly have been, *Concerning the making Peace between the Churches of Africa and Rome, and the Church of Alexandria*. And if the *Africans* had no Difference with *Theophilus*, they had none with *Atticus*, because they were both engaged in the same Cause.

The Canon it self is this: *It is thought fit to write to the most holy Pope Innocent,*

(m) Ὁμωρίη τὸ ἑβδόμων, καὶ Θεοδοσίη τὸ δέυτερον, Αὐγύστου ἑξατάτων Ἰουλίου (ἢ Ἰαννουαρίου). Binii Concil. Tom. 1. p. 957. And *John* died the 14th of the following September. Vid. Socrat. H. E. L. 6. c. 21.

(n) Cod. Can. Eccles. Afric. c. 101. Περὶ τῆς εἰρηνοποιουμένης τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ῥώμης καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας.

312 A TREATISE against the

concerning the Difference between the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, that those two Churches may keep that Peace with one another, which the Lord commands (o). These Words seem plainly to imply, that the Church of Africa acted as a Mediator between the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, and that she was not engaged on either side.

Chrysostom indeed wrote a Letter of Thanks to Aurelius Bishop of Carthage; but therein he thanks him, not for breaking off Communion with Atticus or Theophilus; but only for having endeavoured to procure Peace in the Church (p): and we know from this Canon in what manner he endeavoured it, viz. by offering to be a Mediator, but not by breaking off Communion with either Party.

To proceed to the Western Church; Theodoret says, that the Bishops of Europe

(o) Ἡρεσεν ἰπ μὴν ὥς ἐξεί τ' διχονοίας τ' Ῥωμανικῆς καὶ Ἀλεξανδρινῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς δ' ἀγιάτιον πάπαν Ἰννοκέντιον ρεσφύσας, ὅπως ἐκείτης ἐκκλησίας αὐτὸς αἰδέλας εἰρήνην φυλάξων, ἢ ὁ Κύριος παραγγέλλει.

(p) Διὰ ταῦτα σὺ χερίζεις πολλὰς ἰσθμῶν, ὅτι πόρην πολλὴν καὶ ἰδοῦναι ὑπὲρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιᾶν ἐλόβησθαι, κ. τ. λ. Et infra; ἐνέστησαν, ὅσων αὐτὸς ἀνέβη τὴν ἀμοιβὴν, ἐκκλησίας τοσαύτας παραδομένης διὰ τὴν καλὴν ταύτης (πυθὸς ἀπαλαστήσαν μὴν θορύβων καὶ παραχῆς, εἰς ἣν χαλκὸν ἀμύμονος εἰρήνης ἐρμίσσων ἐκ πυθόνας. Epist. Chrysost. 37.

and

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 313

and of the West, broke off Communion with Chrysostom's Deposers. But Theodoret is the only Historian of any Antiquity and Credit, who says this (*); and probably by the *Western* Bishops mentioned in this Passage, we ought to understand no more than the *Italian* Bishops. For Rome being the chief Church, and *Italy* the principal Country of the *West*, the *Italian* Bishops were often, by way of Eminence, called the *Western* Bishops. Besides, Palladius was not inclined to lessen the Number of the *Joannites*, and the most that he says is (q), "That tho' John was dead, the Church of the ROMANS did not design to communicate with the *Easterns*, and especially not with *Theophilus*, till those Matters were examined in a OEcumenial Synod." And so in many other Passages he calls those *Westerns*, who declared for John, by the Name of *Romans* (r).

Indeed he says in another Place, that the *Western* Legates sent in behalf of

(*) *Georgius Alex.* indeed says the same: but then he copies *Theodoret* Word for Word; so that his Authority must be looked upon as the same with *Theodoret's*.

(q) P. 214. Ὁ δὲ σκοπὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων εἶναι ἐστίν, ἵνα τίς μὴ κρινώσιν τοῖς ἀναθλιγῶσι ἐπισκόποις, κ. τ. λ.

(r) Θεόδωρος μίχας τίς ἐρωμεῖας τῇ τῶν πᾶν Ῥωμαίων κρινώσιν. Pallad. p. 77. Add. p. 26, 27, 28.

John

John, carried with them to Constantinople, the Commonitory of the Synod of the whole West (S); and possibly it might pass for such. But 1. it seems probable from Palladius himself, that none but *Italians* were present at that Synod; for in this very Passage no particular Bishops are named, but *Italians*, nor any Province but that of *Italy* (t). And in another Passage (u), he gives this Account of their Meeting: "*Honorius* commands a Synod of the WESTERNS to assemble: which Bishops of ITALY being gathered together to desire the Emperor to write to *Arcadius*." 2. There is no Token, that the *Westerns* had Excommunicated the *Easterns* before the Meeting of this Synod, nor that this Synod Excommunicated them. On the contrary, this Synod desired, that there might be an OEcumenical Synod to try this Cause, and they would never Excommunicate the *Easterns*, till they knew whether they would comply with that

(f) Pallad. p. 31. Ὑπομνητικὸν τῆς συνόδου πάσης δύσεως.

(t) Λαζάρους — τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ τῆς βασιλείας Ὁριγίου, τῆς Ἰωάννου (l. Ἰννοκентίου), καὶ τῶν Ἰταλῶν ἐπισκόπων, κ. τ. λ.

(u) Περγένιος (Georgius Alex. legit περὶ τῆς συνόδου συγκαταθεῖναι τὴν δύσιν· οἱ τινες ἐπίσκοποι τῆς Ἰταλίας συναχθέντες, παρεκλήθη τῇ βασιλείᾳ χεῖρα τοῦ ἰαυτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. Pallad. p. 29.

Proposal. So that supposing this to have been a Synod of the whole *West*, it will not from thence follow, that all the *Western* Bishops broke off Communion with the *Easterns*.

I have shewn not only from general Testimonies, but by descending to particular Bishops and Patriarchates, that the Bishops of the *Eastern* Church, taken in the largest Sense, acknowledged *Atticus*: But now as to the *Westerns*, I cannot find, that the Churches or the particular Bishops of *Gaul* or *Spain*, or of any other *Western* Country except *Italy*, are once named as concerned in this Dispute. Letters passed to and fro between *Chrysoftom* and some *Western* Bishops; but those Bishops were *Italians* (w). *Italians*, and no others are mentioned by Name, as present at that Synod, which *Palladius* calls a *Western* one (x). The Legates sent by that Synod to *Constantinople* appear to have been *Italians*, except one *Cythegius*; and what Country he was Bishop of, I can-

(w) For Instance, *Innocent*, *Venerius*, *Chromatius*, and *Gaudentius*, respectively Bishops of *Rome*, *Milan*, *Aquileia*, and *Brixia*. Vid. *Pallad.* p. 10, 22. And the 50th Epistle of *Chrysoftom* is inscribed *Ἐκ τῶν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ*.

(x) Vid. *Pallad.* p. 29, 30, 31.

316 A TREATISE against the

not learn: As neither, what Country *Marianus* was Bishop of, who also seems to have been one of those Legates (γ).

And farther, even these *Italians* are only mentioned before and at this Synod; when the *Westerns* had not yet Excommunicated the *Easterns*. And afterwards, no Synod, nor any Bishop by Name, is said to have Excommunicated them, but Pope *Innocent*. And he did it in his own Name alone, and not in the Name of any Synod, if we may believe that Epistle to be his, which *George of Alexandria* (z) gives us for such. And it may be doubted, whether one Reason which disposed him to it, were not, because the *Joannites* had applied to him, and because *Theophilus* did not comply with his Proposal, or rather Command (a), to have the Cause heard in an OEcumenical

(γ) The Legates mentioned by Name, are *Æmilius* of *Beneventum*, *Gaudentius* of *Brixia*, and *Cythegius*, and two Presbyters of *Rome*, and one Deacon of the same Church. *Pallad.* p. 29, 30. And it appears probable, that Bishop *Marianus* was another of those Legates, from *Pallad.* p. 32.

(z) Ἐγὼ ὡς πιστάδοις τὸ ἱερόν τε μεγάλην ἀποστολὴν Πέτρου ἀποδίδωμι σέ (Ἀρκάδιον) Ἀρσένιον ἃ ἐ μὲ δάνατον καὶ πατρὶσιν σου πᾶσι τοῖς συγκληρονόμοις αὐτοῦ πατρὶσιν ἐπισκόποις. *Georg. Alex. Vita Chrysost.* p. 248. *Edit. Savil.* And this Epistle is also recited by *Nicephorus*, H. E. L. 13. c. 34.

(a) *Innocent* writes thus to *Theophilus*, Ἀπάντησον τῇ κατὰ χρεὶν γὰρ καὶ ἀνάγκην (Georg. Alex. legit γὰρ ἀνάγκην) συνόδῳ. *Pallad.* p. 24. *Conf.* p. 23.

menical

menical Synod. For the Popes were very early inclined to favour any thing which look'd like an Appeal. And particularly Pope *Innocent* was of an aspiring Temper, and forward to extend his Jurisdiction: which I need not prove, since the Historical Collector has saved me that Trouble (b). So that probably by the *Western* we ought to understand only the *Italian* Bishops; and of the *Italians* no Synod, nor any Bishop by Name is said to have Excommunicated the *Easterns*, but Pope *Innocent*; and perhaps he did it chiefly to assert his Papal Jurisdiction over the *Eastern* Church.

Upon the whole then; it was incumbent on our Adversaries to make good, what they had so often and so confidently asserted, that the whole Catholick Church, except a *small Party*, broke off Communion with *Atticus*, till he had inserted *John's* Name in the Diptychs. But

(b) *Excerpts*, p. 196. *Innocent* was a Topping Bishop. We meet with some Remains of his, in which he seems to have aspired to a sort of Jurisdiction over his Sister-Churches in *Africa*: Certain Epistles which they wrote to him concerning *Pelagius*, in which they address him with a great deal of Deference, giving him Occasion, as he apprehended, an Opportunity to assume too much Power in his Answers to them. See inter *Augustini Epistolas*, Ep. 90, 91, &c.

it is no wonder they did not perform it, since it is highly *probable* that the contrary is true, and that *Atticus* was acknowledged by all the Catholick Church, except a small Number: And it is *certain*, that he was not rejected by the *African* or *Eastern* Bishops, who were a Majority of the Christian Church, tho' our Adversaries Modestly call those who did not reject him, *The small Alexandrian Faction*.

Yet if they had been comparatively *few*; it would have become our Adversaries not to have called them *Faction*, out of respect to the learned and pious Bishops among them, and particularly to their Leader *St. Cyril*, who did so great Service to the Church of God, especially against *Nestorius*. But since they do not treat such holy Fathers with common Civility, we have no reason to be moved with their Reproaches of us. But this by the Way.

Supposing then *St. Chrysostom's* Deposition to have been Uncanonical, and that the *Illyrian* and *Western* Bishops did not communicate with *Atticus* till he had admitted his Adversaries Name into the Diptychs; then as on the one hand they thought it unlawful, so on the other Hand the *Africans* and *Easterns* thought it lawful to communicate with the Successor of a Bishop unjustly deposed:

sed : And as the *Westerns* insisted on Satisfaction, so the *Easterns* thought them mistaken in so doing. So that after we have, for Argument sake, granted to our Adversaries all that they have any colour for, this Case of *St. Chrysostom* makes more for us than for them.

But they pretend, that the *Easterns*, by writing *John's* Name in the Diptychs, confessed, that they had been in the wrong. In answer to which I observe,

3. That *Atticus* by writing *John's* Name in the Diptychs, did not acknowledge him to have been rightful Bishop of *Constantinople* to his Death.

The Diptychs were Church Registers of two sorts. 1. Those of the *Living*, wherein were entolled the Names of Living Persons in high Stations, for whom Christians prayed in the Church (c). 2. The Diptychs of the *Dead* : wherein were registred the Names of departed Bishops, and other Men and Women (d),

(c) *Atticus*, in his abovementioned Letter to *Cyril*, speaking of the Diptychs, says, Πολλὸν ἦν τὸ μῖσος τῶν ὁμοιωμάτων τὸ πῦρ, ὃ τὸ ἴδιον ὑπὲρ γῆς τυγχάνοντων. ὥστε καὶ συνδιαίρεσθαι τὰς βίβλους αὐτῶν τῶν μνημονευομένων καὶ ἀπασι-
Conf. *Liturgiam inter Chrysost. Opera*, Tom. 6. p. 998, 999.

(d) *Atticus*, in the same Letter, speaking of *Chrysostom's* being inserted in the Diptychs, says, Μνημονεύειν ἡμεῖς τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου ἐμὲν ἐπισκόπων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἀρχιερέων, καὶ λαϊκῶν, καὶ γυναικῶν.

who

who had been eminent for their Piety (e) and Orthodoxy (f). And these were recited in Divine Service, to excite the Living to emulate the Virtues of the Dead (g), in the following Form; *Everlasting is (or be) the Memory of the most holy Patriarchs, Ignatius, Photius, &c. (h).*

The Admission then of a Man's Name into these Diptychs implied, that he was reputed to have lived in the true Faith

(e) Τῶν ὁ ἱερῶν πλυχῶν ἡ μὲν τὴν εὐρίην ἀνδρῶν αἰνὰ κηρύττει τὴν ἰστίαν βελωνίαν, ἔσθ' ἐν ἐκείνῳ ζῶντι πλεονεξίᾳ ἀμειψάμενος ἀφικρομένους, ἡμᾶς μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν δι' ὁμοιότητος αὐτῶν μακαρίστην ἔξιν καὶ θιοειδῆ λῆξιν ἀποτίπτυσσι ἐχειρομαγύσσει. Dionys. Arcop. de Eccles. Hierar. c. 3. p. 98, 99. Edit. Paris, 1615.

(f) Because the Synod of Chalcedon had made an honourable mention of *Leo* and *Cyril* for their Orthodoxy, and because *Cyril* was recorded in the Diptychs, but not *Leo*; the Council of Constantinople under *Mennas* thought fit to supply that Defect, and decreed, τὴν ἰστίαν παρὰ τῇ ἀγίᾳ πύλῃ συνόδῳ ἐπὶ συστάσει τῇ ἐρδοδοξίας τηρηθῆναι, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς διπύχῳ, ἐπὶ ἀφελείᾳ καὶ εἰρήνῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, κηρύττειν. Vid. Relationem Synodi ad Joannem Patriar. Binii Conc. Tom. 4. p. 79. Ibid. p. 78. The Synod decreed, that *Euphemius* and *Macedonius* should be recorded in the Diptychs, because upon Examination they found, that they had been *Orthodox*, Conf. p. 97.

(g) Ἡμᾶς μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν δι' ὁμοιότητος αὐτῶν μακαρίστην ἔξιν καὶ θιοειδῆ λῆξιν ἀποτίπτυσσι ἐχειρομαγύσσει. Dion. Arcop. Supra. Ἐπὶ ἀφελείᾳ καὶ εἰρήνῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Concil. sub Menna Supra.

(h) Ἰγνατίου. Φωτίου ——— τῶν ἀγιωτάτων πατριάρχων, ἀδωνία ἡ μνήμη. Cod. Baroc. p. 14, 29, 30. Conf. Pandect. Beveregii, Tom. 2. Par. 2. p. 292.

and

and Fear of God. The ranking him there among Bishops, supposed, that he once had been a Bishop, or at least had been so entituled. But it was accidental, that the Diptychs implied this: For not only Bishops, but other Persons were register'd there; and Bishops were register'd there, for the same Reasons as other Persons were, viz. not because they were Bishops, but because they were esteemed Saints. The Primitive Bishops indeed being generally Holy Men, and better known to be so, than Private Christians, most of them were register'd in the Diptychs. Which I judge to have been the Reason, that it came to pass at length, that to deny a Bishop a Place in the Diptychs, was in effect, to charge him with Heterodoxy or Immorality.

Now there had been a long Separation of the *Joannites*, and *Innocent*, even after *John's* Death, designed never to communicate with *Atticus*, till he should obey his first Proposal or Command, to have an OEcumenical Council assembled on this Occasion. But at last, probably because he perceived he could not obtain his Desire, he only insisted that *John's* Name should be written in the Diptychs (i).

The

(i) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τις τὴν ὡσηγορίαν μόνον τῆς μακαρίας Ἰωάννου τῆς μυστικῆς δέλεος γραφῆται ἠδὲ λησται. Attici Epist. ad

The People of *Constantinople* also, tho² they communicated with *Atticus*, and thereby acknowledged his Rightfulness, yet happened to be almost in a Tumult, to have this Respect shewn to *John's* Memory. So for the sake of Peace, *Atticus* complied, and thereby acknowledged, that *John* was a holy Man and worthy of Remembrance; and accordingly, in his Letter to *Cyrl*, he calls him, *The Blessed John*. And he owned, that he designed also to acknowledge, that *John* formerly had been a Bishop (k).

But this Admission of *John's* Name into the Diptychs was not, as Dr. *Hickes* falsely pretends, (l) a Confession, That he had been unjustly deposed, and that *Atticus* took his Succession from him. For it may happen, that a Bishop may, on account of his Mistakes, be rightfully Deposed; and yet be in the main a good Man, and consequently entitled to a Place in the Diptychs. And those who desired to have this Honour done to *Chrysostom*, do not appear

ad *Cyrillum*, Confer *Innocentii Epist.* 16. *Maximiano Episcopo*, & in eam *Binii Notas*.

(k) Οὐχ ὡς ἐπισκόπου γενομένου, ἀλλ' ὡς πάλαι μὲν τότε γενομένου. *Epist.* Attici ad ejus Diaconos *Petrum & Aedesium* apud *Niceph.* H. E. L. 14. c. 26.

(l) Pag. 297.

to have looked upon it, as an acknowledgment of the Injustice of his Condemnation. Particularly *Innocent* in his Letter to *Arcadius* and *Eudoxia*, gives no other Reason for his insisting upon it, but this; *That it was unjust to rob the Church of John's Name, which was worthy to be remembred;* (m), or in other Words, to deprive Christians of the Edification, which they might receive by being put in mind of his Example. And if that Epistle should not be allowed to be genuine: yet from thence we may at least collect, that *George* knew of no other Reason. For it is he who gives us this Letter, in his History of *Chrysostom*; and he was Archbishop of *Alexandria* about the Year 620, when it was the Custom to recite the Names of deceased Saints during Divine Service; and therefore he undoubtedly understood the meaning of it. But to put this Matter beyond all Dispute; *Atticus* himself expressly declares, *That John's Name was not written in the Diptychs, as the Name of one who was rightful Bishop of Constantinople at his Death* (n).

(m) Δίκαιον ὃ τῷ ὑπάρχει, μὴ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔ
 ἀξιωμασμένον αὐτὸν ὀνομασθῆναι. Georg. Alex. p. 251.
 (n) Οὐχ ὡς ἐπισκόπος γεγραφέν. Vid. *Supra*.

And to make this still more clear, I shall shew, 4. That *Atticus* did not expunge *Arsacius's* Name out of the Diptychs.

If he had indeed, it would have appeared like an Acknowledgment, that *Arsacius* was an Usurper, and consequently *Atticus* too, till *John* died: but not, that *Atticus* was an Usurper, till he had made this satisfaction. For he might become rightful Bishop of *Constantinople* upon *John's* Death, and his own Reception by his Diocese, and by such other Persons, as had a Right to be concerned in constituting the Bishop of *Constantinople*.

But it is far from being true, that *Atticus* expunged *Arsacius's* Name. No ancient Historian says any thing of it. Besides, *Theodoret* could not well omit it through forgetfulness, because he relates in two different Passages (o), the Insertion of *John's* Name into the Diptychs.

And farther, *Theodoret* in the End of his History, puts *Arsacius* in his Catalogue of the rightful Bishops of *Constantinople*; which he would never have done, if his Name had been expunged, and his Title disowned by the *Eastern Church*.

(o) H. E. L. 5. c. 34, 35.

It will be objected perhaps, that in the same Place he mentions *Heretical* Bishops: And it is true, that he does so: but then he puts a manifest Difference between *them* and the *Orthodox*; calling for instance, *Eusebius, the Arian, and Demophilus, the Heretick* (p). Possibly it may still be said, that *Arsacius* was *Orthodox*. To which I answer, that when *Theodoret* mentions such as he reputed *not rightful* Bishops, tho' they were *Orthodox*, he sufficiently distinguishes *them* as well as *Heretical* Bishops from *Catholick* ones. So he esteemed *Meletius* and *Flavianus* to be rightful Bishops of *Antioch*; and therefore for distinction sake, he calls their Rivals *Paulinus* and *Evagrius, Eustathians*, and brings them in *after* all the rest, tho' they were *before* several of them in Point of Time. "Orthodox Bishops, says he, were, *Meletius, Flavianus, Porphyrius, Alexander, Theodotus*: and with these were joined the *Eustathian* Bishops, *Paulinus* and *Evagrius* (q)". But now he

(p) Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοποι, Ἀλέξανδρος, Εὐσέβιος ὁ Ἀρειανὸς ——— Δημόφιλος ὁ αἰρετικός.

(q) Ἀντιοχείων ἐπίσκοποι· Βιπλίος ——— οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι· οἱ Ἀρειανοὶ· Εὐλάλιος ——— ἱππεὶς ὀρθόδοξος· Μελέτιος, Φλαυιανὸς, Πορφύριος, Ἀλέξανδρος, Θεόδοτος καὶ συνήφθησαν τέττις, οἱ ἀπὸ Εὐσταθίου Παυλῆος καὶ Εὐαγρίου.

brings in *Arsacius* among the Catholick Bishops, without the least Mark of Distinction in the following Manner; "*Nec Etarius, John Chrysostom, Arsacius, Atticus, Sisinnius* (r)".

Atticus, as I before observed, says expressly, that he wrote *John* in the Catalogue of Bishops, *not as one who was a Bishop* (when he died), *but as one who formerly had been so*. And *St. Cyril* repeats frequently, from the beginning to the end of his angry Answer to *Atticus*, "That it was contrary to the Rules, that *John* who was degraded, and consequently a Layman, should be reckoned among Clergymen; that he who was only a pretended Bishop, should be enrolled among the true Ones *". But he no where expresses, that *Arsacius's* Name was expunged, as he would undoubtedly have done over and over, had it been true; because he mentions other Things not so considerable: and besides, it was less contrary to the Rules to insert a *pretended*, than to

(r) Νεκταριος, Ἰωάννης ὁ χρυσοστόμος, Ἀρσάκιος, Ἀτίκος, Σισίννιος.

* Πῶς ἂν ἐν ἐπισκόποις ὁ λαϊκός, ἢ πῶς ἐν τοῖς γνησίοις ἂ μὴ τοῖς ἀναφανέσι; Iterum prope medium, Οὐκ ἀκόλουθον, ἐὰν βάλῃται ὡς πρὸς καθεστὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεομὸς, λαϊκὸν συνῆπταμένον τοῖς ἐν ἱερατείᾳ ἀγαγέμενοι.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 327

expunge an *undoubted* Bishop, as Cyril esteemed *Arsacius* to have been.

Lastly, Cyril implies, that *Arsacius's* Name was not struck out of the Dip-tychs, in that very Passage of his Letter, which our Adversaries pretend evidently proves the contrary. “Command, “*says he*, the Name of *John* to be struck “out of the Catalogue of Bishops. For “tho’ we think it signifies nothing, let “not the Apostolical College be grieved “by having the Traitor placed in the “same Rank with them. But the Name “of *Judas* being brought in, in what “Place henceforward must *Matthias* be “ranked? If then no one, casting out “*Matthias*, would enroll *Judas*, as one “of the Apostolical College. Let, I “beseech you, the most famous *Arsa-* “*cus* remain and be continued in the “Second Place to *Nectarius* of glorious “Memory: *Left* any thing being brought “in by Force, *should expel* the Memory “of the blessed *Arsacius* (f)”.
Nectarius

(f) Κέλδουσι τὸ κατὰ λόγον τὸ ἐπισκόπων ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὴν ἰω-
 ανὴν ἀποσημαίνει. εἰ γὰρ ἔστιν εἶναι τὸτο λογίζεσθαι, μὴ λυ-
 πείτω τὸ τὸ δόστωλιν χρεὼν ὁ ἀποστόλης αὐτοῖς συγκαταβῆ-
 ρθῶ· εἰσφρομένης ὅ τὸ ἰὺδα ἀποσημαίνει. πῦ λοιπὸν ἡμῖν
 ὁ Ματθαῖος γε κείσεται; εἰ τίινον ἔδωκε τὸ Ματθαῖον ἐμβαλὼν,
 ἔσβαλει

Nectarius was *John's* immediate Predecessor; *Arsacius* succeeded *John* upon his Deposition, and died before him, and had been register'd in the Diptychs of the Dead, while *John* was living, and consequently must at first be recited next after *Nectarius*. But when *John* was admitted into the Catalogue, he must be put next to *Nectarius* his immediate Predecessor, and consequently before *Arsacius*, who could not continue next to *Nectarius*, but must be thenceforward removed down to the next Place but one.

In this Passage then, *Cyril* represents, *First*, That it was an Affront to Bishops in general, to register among them one who was no Bishop, but a Layman. And, *Secondly*, that it was a particular Affront to *Arsacius's* Memory, that *his* Name should be displaced and put lower to make room for his *Rival's*. And as the inserting *Judas* among the Apostles must have made *Matthias* the *Thirteenth*, and consequently have cast him out of the Number of the *Twelve* Apostles: So it is possible, that *Cyril*, to exaggerate Matters, might argue,

ἐγράψαι τὸ ἴδιον τὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὄνομα, μὲντοι καὶ συζῆσαι
 παρὰ τὸν μὲν τὸ ἀποστόλου μνήμης Νεκταρίου, διότι καὶ
 ἔπειτα φημι Ἀρσακίῳ βαθμῶς ἵνα μὴ π βία παρεσχηθῇ
 ἑαυτῷ ἔμμελιν τὴν μνήμην.

that

that the receiving *John's* Name might be construed for an Acknowledgment, that he had been unjustly deposed, and that *Arsacius* had wrongfully succeeded him: And so might by a rigid Interpretation be taken to expunge *Arsacius's* Name.

But, as it has been before shewn, that this was not intended by *Atticus*, when he inserted *John's* Name; so *Cyril's* own Words plainly imply, that this was not actually done. For he therefore desires, that *John's* Name should be blotted out again; *LEST any thing being brought in by Force, SHOULD EXPEL the Memory of the blessed Arsacius.* And I suspect, that the reason why our Adversaries, when they published the rest of this Passage, omitted this last Sentence was, because it shews so plainly, that *Arsacius's* Name did really remain in the Diptychs.

Besides, *Cyril* would never have asked, *In WHAT Place henceforward must Arsacius be ranked?* If he had known, that he had not been ranked in ANY PLACE at all. Nor would he have written, that he desired, *that Arsacius might continue in the SECOND Place to Nectarius*, but would have complained directly, that they would allow him NO Station whatsoever.

Our

Our Adversaries endeavour to prove, that *Arfacius's* Name was actually expunged, from *Reason* and *Testimony*. From *Reason*; "1. Because it is inconsistent in "the Nature of the Thing, that two "Bishops, who claim a Title to the "same See, at the same Time, should "notwithstanding be both enrolled in "the Church-Register, as Bishops of that "See (1).

Ans. 1. We might suppose, that *Atticus* was not willing to declare on either side. And tho' it was inconsistent, that these two Bishops should have a Right to the See of *Constantinople* at the same time: yet it was not inconsistent, that they should be both enrolled in the *Dip-tychs*, as Bishops of that See at the same Time, because they both pretended to it. And it is common, even upon the most solemn Occasions, to give Persons the Titles claimed by them, tho' we do not think them to be their due. And *Atticus*, to perswade *Cyril* to put *St. Chrysostom's* Name into the *Dip-tychs* of his Church, alledges, "That *Paulinus* and *Eva-*
"grius, tho' faulty Leaders of the Di-
"vision at *Antioch*, had been long since,
"to pacify the People, inserted into the

(1) See Dr. *Hickes*, p. 295.

“ Diptychs of that Church ; and that
 “ this was no more prejudice to the Right-
 “ ful Bishops, than it was to *David* to
 “ bury *Saul* honourably, or than it was
 “ to the Apostles to bury *Eudoxius* the
 “ *Arian* under the same Altar with
 “ them (u).”

Now, *Chrysostom* indeed was chosen in-
 to a See confessedly vacant, and was,
 till his Deposition, Bishop of *Constanti-*
nople without a Rival. But *Paulinus* and
Evagrius were successively chosen Bishops
 of *Antioch*, when *Meletius* and *Flavia-*
nus claimed that See; and all the Time
 that they pretended to be Bishops of
Antioch, their Rivals pretended to be
 so too. So that when their Adversaries
 gave them, as well as their Rivals, a
 Place in the Diptychs; they did really
 Register several Rivals as Bishops of the
 same See at the same time, because they
 all claimed to be so. And yet they thought
 that this did not at all disparage the Title
 of the Rightful Bishops.

Ans. 2. Supposing that they could not
 both be enrolled, as Bishops of the same
 See, at the same time: yet they might,

(u) “Ουπ γάρ π τ Δαυιδ ἔβλαψεν ἡ ἔνλημ. ὁ Σαὺλ καθεῖα·
 ἔπ τὰς ἀποδόλως ὁ τῆς ὁ Ἀρεῖα ἀσεβείας ὁπαδὸς Εὐδόξιο·
 ὑπὸ τὸ αὐτὸ θυσιαστήριον κείμετο· ἔπ Παυλινὸς π καὶ Ἐναγ-
 ριο, οἱ γινόμενοι ἀρχιερεῖς ὁ χρίσματος τ ἐν Ἀποχείρ-
 ῃ καλῆς, ὅπ μιστὶ θάνατον. πολὺς ἐξέτε χρόνιο, πῶς μυσ-
 τικοῖς διπτύχοις, ἀπ τῆ λαῶν εἰρήνην π καὶ ὁμόνοιαν, ἐνεργού-
 σων.”

as Bishops of the same See one after another. *Arsacius* and *Chrysostom* claim'd the same See at the same Time: therefore while *Chrysostom* was living, to have pray'd for him as Patriarch, in the Diptychs of the *Living*, might perhaps have look'd like an Acknowledgment of his Right. But when he was dead, it was no Absurdity, both to mention him as a Patriarch in the Diptychs of the *Dead*, who had been indisputably so, till he was deposed, and to mention *Arsacius* as one who rightfully succeeded him upon his Deposition. And, as I before shewed, that *Atticus* intended, by putting St. *Chrysostom* into the Diptychs, to acknowledge, that he once had been a Patriarch: So by continuing *Arsacius* in the Diptychs, he maintained, that *Arsacius* was rightful Patriarch after *Chrysostom*. And it was the common Practice, when a Bishop had been unjustly deposed, and had been succeeded by an Orthodox Bishop, to mention both their Names in the Diptychs (w).

Their 2d Argument drawn from Reason is, "To have commemorated St. *Chrysostom* and *Arsacius* at the Altar at the same time,

(w) Vid. *Cod. Baroc. Edit. ab Hodyo. p. 14, 29, 30.*

" would

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 333

“ would have been the greatest mocking
“ of God.”

Ans. If there were any Weight in this Argument, it would conclude more strongly against commemorating *Paulinus* and *Evagrius*, together with their Rivals *Meletius* and *Flavianus*: Since those did not succeed one another, but claimed at the same time, and at the same time only. Since then this Argument was of no Force in *that* Case, it must be even of less than none in the Case before us; because *Chrysostom* really preceded *Arsacius*, and was for a Time indisputably Bishop of *Constantinople*. And therefore to commemorate *Chrysostom* and *Arsacius* as Persons who had at different Times been Bishops of that See, (which *Atticus* declares was all that he intended), could be no mocking of God; since it was true, that they had been so.

Let us now see, whether the Arguments of our Adversaries from *Testimony* be more conclusive, than those from *Reason* have proved. They own, that *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodore*, do not mention the expunging *Arsacius's* Name (x). But to salve this they say, that those Hi-

(x) Vid. Dr. Hickes, p. 295.

storians omitted it, *because they thought it was included in the restoring of St. Chrysostom's Name*: which is plainly to beg the Question. The only Argument they produce from Testimony, is that Passage in St. Cyril's Letter, wherein he desires Atticus to command John's Name to be struck out of the Diptychs again; which Passage, as I have already shewn, fully proves, that Atticus had not expunged Arsacius's Name.

5. If the Joannites had been in the right to refuse communicating with Atticus, till he had admitted John into the Diptychs; it would not from hence follow, that our Adversaries are justifiable in continuing to disown our present Bishops, because the Cases are by no means parallel. The Cause of our pretended Schism is ceased: But the Joannites might think, that the Ground of their Division was continued. The Cause of their Division was the Injury done to St. Chrysostom: and they might be of Opinion, that this Injury was continued to his Memory. For to deny him a Place in the Diptychs, might be understood to imply, that he was not worthy of Remembrance and Imitation; but had been either Heterodox, or Immoral, or both. To which Innocent added, as I before observed, that

that it was an Injury to the Church to rob Christians of the Benefit they might receive by being put in mind of *Chrysostom's* Example. But what Injury can our Adversaries complain of? Is any Affront offer'd to the Memory of the Depriv'd Bishops? Are they censured as Immoral or Heretical? Or are there any Diptychs at present, out of which their Names are erased, and and into which they may be restored (y)?

6. Supposing that the *Joannites* might have required their Adversaries to undergo Penance, which they certainly did not require: yet the *Non-Conforming Nonjurors* have no ground to insist, that our Bishops should make Satisfaction. For the *Joannites* had several Diocesans on their side; nay, if we believe our Adversaries, almost all the Diocesans of the Christian Church: but our Adversaries have none among them, who do so much as pretend to be Diocesans, and therefore they have no Authority to impose Penance on our Bishops, as I have before shewn.

To this our Adversaries make the following Reply, which having been omitted in its proper Place, I take Leave to insert here, because I would not pass by any thing which bears the Shew of an Objection.

“ Our

(y) Comp. *Mr. Dodwell's Case in Fact*, p. 37.

“ Our want of *Power* to compel your
 “ intruding Bishops to make Canonical
 “ Satisfaction is no more an Argument,
 “ that we ought to go to your Churches,
 “ notwithstanding they have not made
 “ such Satisfaction: than our want of
 “ *Power* to compel you to do your Duty
 “ as to the *State*, is an Argument, that
 “ we ought to comply with you in your
 “ (pretended) Rebellion (z).

Answ. There is a great Difference between these Cases in many Points, whereof I shall only mention two.

1. In the *former* Case, *Power* is used in a *moral* Sense for lawful *Authority*; in the *latter*, it is used in a *natural* Sense for *Strength*. And it may be a Demonstration, that we are not bound to do a thing, because it is only required by Men who want *Authority* to command us; and yet none, because it is required only by Men, who want *Strength* to force us.

That in the *latter* Case, *Power* is understood in a *natural* Sense for *Strength*, is plain, because our Adversaries will not grant, that they have no *Authority* with relation to the *State*; but pretend, that tho' they be not *strong* enough to force

(z) See Dr. Hickes, p. 236, 237.

us to repair the supposed Injuries we have committed ; yet there is One, who, in their Opinion, has *Authority* to *command* us to do it. And if that were a *true* Opinion, as it is a *false* one, we should be bound to make amends as to the State, because we should be commanded to do it by competent Authority. But it does not from thence follow, that we are bound to make Satisfaction as to the Church ; since our Adversaries want Authority to enjoin it, as they themselves allow, or at least suppose in this Reply of theirs.

2. In the *former* Case the Doctor speaks of us, as he concludes us to be *Schismatics*, barely because we *formerly opposed* the pretended Diocesan Authority of some particular Persons long since *deceased*. In the *latter* Case he considers us as *Rebels*, not only because, as he falsely imagines, we *formerly rebelled* against the *late King James* : but because we do, in his mistaken Opinion, *now actually rebel* against a Person, who is *living*, and claims our Obedience. Now it may be Mens Duty to make Reparation for *present* and actual Opposition, and where the Persons opposed are *alive* and capable of receiving Reparation : and yet it may not be necessary for Men to give Satisfaction for

Z

past

past Injuries; where the Persons injured are *deceased*, and incapable of receiving Satisfaction.

And therefore Dr. *Hickes*, to have made the Cases more nearly parallel, should have supposed the late King *James*, and all claiming on Pretence of Hereditary Succession from him, to be deceased. But then, this Supposition would have turned against him. For as it has been fully proved, that even in our *present* Case we are under no Obligation to make Satisfaction, as to the *State*: so the *Non-jurors* themselves must confess, that we should be under no such Obligation, in case all claiming on Pretence of Hereditary Succession from the late King *James* were deceased. And consequently, by Parity of Reason, they ought also to grant, that we are under no Obligation to make Satisfaction, as to the *Church*, since all the Diocesans are dead, without any Successor who has a right to claim Satisfaction.

To Sum up this whole Case of *Chrysostom*: It is not certain that his second Deposition was uncanonical; and if it were Canonical, the *Joannites* were undoubtedly Schismaticks, and consequently our Adversaries too, if they be so exactly like them as they pretend. Our Adversaries pretend that the whole Catho-
lick

lick Church, except a small Party, rejected *Atticus*, till he had received *John* into the Diptychs: but it is *certain*, that the Majority of the Catholick Church acknowledged *Atticus* long before that Time: and it is *probable* that he was never rejected, except by a few *Joannite* Bishops in the *East*, and by the *Illyrians* and *Italians*, or at most, by the *Westerns*: so that it is clear, that this Case of *Chrysostom* proves nothing against us. Most of the *Easterns* believed the Deposition of *John* to be unjust, and yet communicated with *Atticus*: whereby they declared their Judgment, that the Church may submit to Bishops constituted in the room of others unjustly deposed; which confirms my *Third Head*. The *Joannites* would not allow the Sentence of the Synod *ad Quercum* to be valid, because they thought them not to be competent Judges. Yet many of them acknowledged *Atticus* in Obedience to the Emperor's Edict, which is an Argument, that they did believe the Civil Power had Authority in that respect, and consequently strengthens my *Second Proposition*. *Atticus* admitted *John's* Name into the Diptychs, and continued *Arsacius's* there; and thereby acknowledged, that *John* was a good Man, and had been Patriarch till he was deposed, and at the

same time maintained, that *Arsacius* was rightful Patriarch after *John's* Deposition. The *Joannites* might think, that the Cause of the Division continued after *John's* Death; because the denying him a Place in the Diptychs, seemed to continue the Injuries to him, and to imply, that he was not a good Man. But our Adversaries have no such Pretence. And, Lastly, Supposing the *Joannites* might have required *Atticus* to undergo Penance; yet our Adversaries cannot insist, that our Bishops should make Satisfaction, because the *Joannites* had Diocesans among them, but our Adversaries have none, and consequently no Authority to impose Penance.

Thus I have been contented, for the Benefit of our Adversaries, to suppose that we may be mistaken: and, I think, they also ought in Decency to suppose in their Turn, that they may be mistaken. And then let them consider, that we do not require publick Satisfaction and Acknowledgment of them, and that it would become them to imitate our Moderation, and not, like the *Donatists*, to insist rigidly upon Satisfaction from our Bishops: especially since, if they should be in the right, I have shewn, that they have not Authority to call us to account; but if
we

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 341

we be in the right, as I have proved, that we are ; then we have on our side, Colleges of Bishops indisputably vested with sufficient Authority to require Satisfaction of them.

The last Part of the Third Objection of our Adversaries is, that supposing our Bishops to have been Schismatics, *they ought to have their Orders confirmed (a).*

Ans. It has been sometimes required, that Orders confer'd by Schismatical Bishops should be authoritatively allowed of: but then it has been required by them who had Power to exercise Discipline over Bishops, as by the OEcumenical Council of *Nice*. And it is not a thing absolutely necessary, because, as I have proved, such Orders are in themselves Valid. And it is no more an Argument that the *Nicene* Fathers judg'd an Allowance of such Orders to be absolutely necessary, because they required it; than it is a Proof, that our Church esteems private Baptism administred by a Clergyman out of his own Parish to be invalid; because she commands, that Persons so baptized shall be afterward brought to the Church, that their Baptism may be there solemnly approved of, and that they may be publickly received into Christ's Congre-

(a) *Dr. Hickes, p. 209, 270, 314, 315.*

gation, and signed with the Sign of the Cross.

And therefore, as I before observed (b), tho' the Schismatical *Donatists* rejected the Orders and Baptism of the Catholicks; yet the Catholicks in *Africa* did not scruple to admit the perfect Validity of the *Donatist* Bishops and Clergy, without requiring them to be confirmed. And in like manner the Church of *England* has, from the beginning of the Reformation to this Time, admitted the Orders of Converts from Popery, without enjoining them to be confirmed. And even one of our Adversaries plainly testifies, that Orders confer'd by Popish Bishops, do not want Confirmation. "If we suppose, says he, the Island of *Sicily* to have a Set of Popish Bishops, with a successive Imposition of Hands from the Apostles, if those Bishops should come to a Sense of their Errors, and cast off the Superstitions of Popery, and at the same Time not refuse Communion with any Branch of the Catholick and undivided Church, they would from that Time commence true Catholick Christians and Bishops of the same Catholick Church (c)." Now if Bishops who are, like the Popish ones, guilty not

(b) *Supra*, p. 221, 267, 268.

(c) *Mr. Earbery's Old English Constitution Vindicated*, p. 95. only

only of Schism, but of Error, Superstition, and Heresy, even according to the Opinion of our Adversaries (*d*), do yet, upon casting off their Errors, and being willing to join in Communion with other Christians, become true Bishops of the Catholick Church, as not only this Author asserts, but every one else must grant: then much more do Schismatical Bishops become true Bishops of the Catholick Church, when the ground of their Schism ceases. And if they be true Bishops of the Catholick Church, they cannot need to have their Orders confirmed.

Object. 4. "What if all the Protestant Bishops in *Ireland* should die, or All except a Few Suffragans: would it be the Duty of the *Irish* Protestant People to go immediately to the Popish Churches (*e*)?"

Ans. No. Because the Papists are Hereticks and Schismatics, the Cause of their Schism and Heresy continuing, *viz.* their uncharitable rejecting other Churches from their Communion, and their requiring unlawful Terms of Communion of their Clergy and People, and the gross Corruption of their Liturgy in every Part of it.

(*d*) *Mr. Earbery's Serious Admonition to Dr. Kennet*, p. 119. *Dr. Hickes*, p. 307. *Modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative*, p. 28. *Dr. Brett's Vindication of himself from the Charge of turning Papist*, p. 7. (*e*) *Dr. Hickes*, p. 164.

But if all the Protestant Bishops in *Ireland* should die except a few Suffragans, and if those Suffragans should thereupon be enstated in the several Sees by all those who have a Right to constitute *Irish* Diocesans; then the People ought to receive them as Diocesans, but not before. Or if all the Protestant *Irish* Bishops, Diocesans and Suffragans, should die, and the Popish *Irish* Bishops should cast off their Errors and Corruptions, and should be enstated in the several Sees, by all those who have a Right to constitute *Irish* Diocesans; it would be the Duty of the Protestant People immediately to submit to those, who had been formerly Popish Bishops. And consequently it is the Duty of our Adversaries to submit to our Diocesans, because supposing them to have been Schismatical, they are not so now; since the Ground of their pretended Schism is taken away; and they are acknowledged by all those who have a Right to constitute our Diocesans.

Object. 5. "We cannot join in Communion with you, because you are guilty of *Herefy*, on account of your maintaining the Validity of Lay-Deprivation, and the Lawfulness of Resisting Kings (*f*).

(*f*) *Dr. Hickes, p. 168, 169.*

Answer,

Answ. This is a high Charge, and our Adversaries sometimes seem to lay the whole Stress of their Cause upon it, and to pretend, that they should not have divided from us, if it had not been for those pernicious and false Doctrines (g). But they have been as defective in making out this Charge, as that of Schism. For,

1. I have, as I hope, fully proved, that Princes have Authority to deprive Bishops for Crimes, and consequently that the Doctrine of the Validity of Lay-Deprivation is a *true* Doctrine. But if we should suppose it to be a Mistake, it can never be accounted a Heresy. This, if an Error, is only an Error, as to one Point of the Exercise of Church-Government. But Heresies are generally esteemed to be Errors in Matters of Faith: However, no Catholick Christians ever thought any thing to be Heresy, but Errors in Fundamentals, *i. e.* in Matters which contained in them the Causes and Conditions of our Sal-

(g) *Ibid.* Our Deprived Fathers always profess'd their Readiness to quit their Personal Rights, provided they could secure the Doctrines (of Non-Resistance, and the Invalidity of Lay-Deprivations). *p.* 170. They would have forgiven their Brethren the Breaches they made in the Episcopal College and Church by the Consecrations of the Anti-Bishops, had they not made them upon pernicious Principles,

vation;

vation; the Denial of some necessary Truth which was contained in exprefs Words of Scripture, or which was at least a plain and evident Deduction from Scripture; or, lastly, Errors which the Church has defined to be Heretical.

Now if it should be true, that Lay-Deprivations are invalid: Yet this would be a Truth, which is no where delivered in exprefs Words of Scripture, and which must be deduced from thence by a remote and obscure Deduction, and a long Train of Consequences, depending upon several Points, which will very hardly be allowed. And farther, The Church has never condemned the Doctrine of the Validity of Lay-Deprivations for a Heresy, as our Adversaries confess (*b*); tho' they will needs have it to be a Heresy upon their own Authority; because it is necessary for the Vindication of their Separation, that it should be so. And Mr. Dodwell owns (*i*), that *the Doctrine of the Independency of the sacred Office on the State is strange to this Age*, and implies (*k*), that it was

(*b*) Dr. Hickes, p. 304. The Doctrine of the Validity of Lay-Deprivations is a Heresy, tho' the Church has never condemn'd it as such. *Comp.* p. 231, &c.

(*i*) *Case in View*, p. 63.

(*k*) *Ibid.* p. 64. Our Brethren in Scotland have been longer in Possession of that Doctrine than here.

not formerly, and consequently is not now the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and that few or no Christians are like to favour it, except the *Calvinists* and *Papists*. And others of our Adversaries seem also plainly to confess, that this Doctrine was not *anciently* the Doctrine of the Reformed Church of *England* (1). So that one would wonder, with what Face they can charge us with Heresy in this Point, when they know they have not the Authority of the Ancient Church to support this Charge, and that they are disowned in it by most, if not all the

(1) Preface to *Church Independent Power not Romish*, p. 9. It is true, this Matter had not been *then* (*viz.* in 1685.) much looked into; several who had great Places in the Church of *England* had stretch'd the Supremacy of the Prince beyond its just Bounds; had made the Church to be *entirely* (*so he represents their Opinion*) dependent on the State. Mr. Collier's *E. H.* Vol. 2. p. 614. b. Where, after having endeavoured to produce Testimonies from Antiquity against Archbishop *Bancroft's* Defence of the Power of the Civil Magistrate to punish Ecclesiastical Persons for Ecclesiastical Offences, Mr. Collier thus proceeds. "The Doctor (*Bancroft*) has not a few *English* Bishops, and other eminent Divines of the Reformation in his Sentiment---. Now the Question will be, Whether these *English* Divines of the 16th and 17th Centuries, who fall in with *Bancroft's* Doctrine, are consistent with the Fathers, or not?" But Mr. Collier does not venture to affirm, that not a few eminent *English* Divines were of a contrary Sentiment: as he would undoubtedly have done, had it been true.

Re-

Reformed, except the *Calvinists*; and especially it is surprizing, that they should be so rash as without the clearest Ground to pass so severe a Censure upon a Doctrine, which, if Protestant Princes had not practised, it would have been morally impossible to have effected our happy Reformation from Popery; as it would have been impossible without a Miracle for the pious Princes among the *Jews* to have reformed their Church from Idolatry, unless they had exercised a much greater Authority in Ecclesiastical Causes, and over Ecclesiastical Persons, than our Adversaries are willing to allow them.

But let us for once gratify our Adversaries, and suppose that to be true, which is most certainly false, *viz.* that the Doctrine of the Validity of Lay-Deprivation is a Heresy; yet how will it appear, that the Church of *England* is *now* more guilty of this pretended Heresy, than she was before the Revolution? Has she made any new Article, Canon, or Determination to establish this Doctrine? Or, can it be infer'd from her Practice? I have shewn, that our Bishops deprived the Nonjuring Bishops; and tho we should condescend so far as to suppose, That the Church had no Hand in depriving those Bishops; yet even this will
not

not convict her of owning the Validity of Lay-Deprivation, but only that she thinks it lawful, when Bishops are Deprived, whether by just or unjust Force, to constitute other Bishops in their room, and to acknowledge Bishops, so constituted. As I observed before (m), that about the Year 511, several Holy Fathers would upon no Account own the Justice of *Macedonius's* Deprivation; and yet they submitted to acknowledge *Timotheus*, who was made Bishop in his Room. And one would think, our Adversaries should blush at their Rashness in deserting the Communion of the Church of *England*, chiefly on Pretence of her maintaining an Opinion, which they imagine to be Heretical; but which is evidently true, and whether it be true or false, they cannot make out, that she has espous'd it more *now*, than she did *before* they deserted her Communion.

As to the *Second Doctrine, the Lawfulness of Resisting Kings*, on Pretence whereof they charge us with Heresy, I answer, that Men acknowledged the present Government on several Principles, none of which are *Heretical*.

(m) *Viz.* p. 89.

Some were of Opinion, that the King of such a limited Monarchy, as ours is, was not the whole Supreme Power, but the King and the Estates; and consequently believed, that the Resistance made to the late King *James the Second*, was not a Resistance of that *Higher or Supreme Power* which *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* forbid us to resist. Our Adversaries have not yet confuted this Opinion. But supposing it to be a *false* one, it is most certainly not an *Heretical* one: Because it is barely a Mistake, as to the Nature of our Laws and Constitution; and Mistakes in the Laws and Constitutions of particular Countries were never yet esteemed *Heresies*. And I would advise our Adversaries not to be too free in charging us with Heresy in this Point. For if it be a Heresy to ascribe too little Authority to the Prince, it must surely for the same Reason be a Heresy to ascribe too little Power to the Estates. And as our Adversaries fancy us to be mistaken as to the Prince's Power; so if they themselves should be in an Error, as to the Power of the Estates, They have pronounced against Themselves the same Sentence of Heresy, which they designed to have fixed upon us; only with this difference, that

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 351

that by uncharitably judging us, they have rendered Themselves inexcusable.

Others came in to the Government, because it was settled, and they judged it lawful to submit to a Power when it was established and settled, whether they could approve of the Means whereby it was obtained and establish'd, or no. Now, that very Convocation of ours which passed the Canons, *Anno 1603*, did, about two Years after, make the following Determination (n). "If any
"Man shall affirm, that when any such
"new Forms of Government begun by
"Rebellion, are after thoroughly settled,
"the Authority in them is not of God;
"or that any who live within the Ter-
"ritories of such new Governments, are
"not bound to be subject to God's Au-
"thority, which is there executed, but
"may rebel against the same, he doth
"greatly Err.

And it was upon much the same Principles, that the abovementioned Fathers received and owned *Timotheus*, tho' they could not approve of the Deprivation of his Predecessor *Macedonius*. And I know not upon what other Principles the Primi-

(n) See Bishop Oyerall's Convocation-Book, Can. 28.
p. 59.

tive Christians could submit, as they readily did, to several *Roman* Emperors, who notoriously obtained their Power by unjust Violence. And when Frontier Towns are conquered backward and forward, the Inhabitants submit to the Conqueror, without considering, whether the War he be engaged in, be just or no. For in long Wars they often are conquered more than once, and submit to each side by Turns. And yet for doing this they are not censured as Heretical. So that if our Adversaries will contend, that this Opinion is a false one, they must either allow it not to be an Heretical one; or else they must blame that as Heretical in *our* Case, which Mankind does not esteem such in *any other* Case; and they must also represent the Church of *England* to have been Heretical in the Reign of King *James the First*, when that Convocation sate; which they will not dare to do.

A *Third* Principle on which Men acknowledged the late King *William*, was this, that they judged that the late King *James the Second* had Abdicated his Government. And this is the Opinion where-with our Adversaries pretend to be most offended. But this Opinion implies no more, than these two Propositions, one
Doctri-

nal, the other a Proposition of Fact, *viz.* that a King may abdicate his Government by acting entirely contrary to the main Ends of Government, and that King *James the Second* did so abdicate. The Consequence whereof is, that it was lawful to resist King *James the Second*, after he had so abdicated; because it was lawful to resist a Person, who once had been a *real* King, but then was only a *nominal* One. Now, this is a Consequence which no one will deny, who allows the Truth of the foregoing Propositions. As to the Propositions themselves, they are asserted by the Convention Parliament. For the Resolve pass'd by the Commons (o) and Lords (p), and confirm'd by their Declaration of Right, and by 1 *W. and M. Sess. 2. Chap. 2.* is this,

“ *Resolv'd*, That King *James II.* having endeavoured to subvert the Constitution of this Kingdom by breaking the Original Contract between King and People, and by the Advice of *Fellows* and other wicked Persons, having violated the Fundamental Laws, and having withdrawn himself out of this Kingdom, hath *abdicated* the Go-

(o) Jan. 25. 1688.

(p) Feb. 7. 1688.

“vernment, and that the Throne is
“thereby vacant.

Mr. *Dodwell* at length found out this to be the State of the Question. For in his last Treatise upon this Subject (*q*), he thus expresses himself. “At present, we
“cannot charge even our faulty Bre-
“thren with Heretical Doctrine, if we
“will judge of them by their avowed
“Principles. They do not pretend it
“lawful to resist a lawful Prince; but
“they alledge an antecedent Reason, by
“which they pretend him not lawful,
“before they think it lawful to resist
“him. Either they pretend the Prince
“resisted by them, never to have had a
“Title, or *that it has ceased before they*
“*resisted him.* It is therefore not the Do-
“ctrine of Resistance against Lawful
“Powers which is owned by them.”
Nay, Dr. *Hickes* seems plainly to have known as well as Mr. *Dodwell*, that the Resistance made to the late King *James II.* was only maintained to be lawful, *because that King had broken the Original Contract, and thereupon ceased to be a real King* (*r*).
And

(*q*) *Case in Fact*, p. 116.

(*r*) In the Letter written with Dr. *Hickes's* Approbation (p. 301), there are these Words. “Remember, that
“the

And therefore it is surprizing that our Adversaries should charge us with Herefy. For as to the Second Proposition, That King *James II.* abdicated, supposing (but by no means granting), that they who asserted it, were mistaken, they were mistaken in a Fact : And Mistakes in Facts cannot be Heresies. And as to the Doctrinal Proposition, that a King may depose himself by acting entirely contrary to the Ends of Government ; it was allow'd by the most zealous Assertors of the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, till the Revolution, particularly by *Barclay*, even in a Book written in Defence of Passive Obedience (*f*). And I know nothing

“ the Prince of *Orange* invaded this Kingdom with an
 “ armed Force ; that great Part of the People joined
 “ with him, and resisted him whom they owned to be
 “ their Lawful Sovereign, and by that Resistance drove
 “ the King out of the Kingdom ; that the Convention
 “ met, and declared that Resistance to be Lawful, be-
 “ cause they pretended the King had broken the Ori-
 “ ginal Contract, that thereupon they declared him to
 “ be no longer King.

(*f*) Nulline Casus incidere possunt, quibus Populo in Regem arma capere, & invadere jure suo liceat ? Nulli certe, quamdiu Rex manet. Non alias igitur in eum Populo potestas est, quam si id committat, propter quod ipso jure Rex esse desinat : tunc enim quia ipse se principatu exiit, &c. *Et paulo infra.* Duos tantum invenio Casus, quibus Rex ipso facto ex Rege non Regem se facit, & omni honore & dignitate Regali atque in subditos

thing in the Canons or Articles of our Church, which contradicts it, nor in Scripture neither. For to assert that a King may abdicate, is by no means the same thing, as to assert the Lawfulness of resisting Kings.

Bishops may, by teaching Heretical Doctrines and other Crimes, so far depose themselves, that their People may be bound to disobey them. The Scripture calls such Bishops *Wolves*, and bids us *beware of them*; a sufficient Intimation, that we ought not to mistake them for *Shepherds*, nor to be led by them. And St. Paul pronounces every one *accursed*, tho' it were *himself*, or even *an Angel from Heaven*, who should preach any other Gospel than what the Apostles had already preached (1). Now we can never be obliged to obey those whom St. Paul so solemnly pronounces *accursed*. And if in such a Case Obedience would not have been due to St. Paul himself, it can never be due to any Bishop his Successor. And

subditos potestate destituit; quorum etiam meminit Winzetus. Horum unus est, si Regnum & Rempublicam evertere conetur; hoc est, si id ei propositum eaque intentio fuerit, ut Regnum disperdar. Barclaius, *Contra Monarchomachos*, L. 3. c. 16. *Confer.* L. 3. c. 8.

(1) Gal. 1. 8, 9.

there-

therefore the 31st Apostolical Canon decrees, " That those Presbyters shall be
 " degraded, and those Laymen Excom-
 " municated, who having nothing where-
 " with to charge their Bishop, as to his
 " Faith and Piety, do yet separate from
 " him (u)." Which implies, that they
 should not be punished, if they deserted
 a Bishop guilty of Profaneness and He-
 terodoxy: And so *Balsamon* expounds this
 Canon (x). *Irenæus* (y) teaches us, that
 we ought to break off Communion with He-
 retical Pastors, and to adhere to those who
 keep the Apostles Doctrine. And St. Cy-
 prian with a Council of African Bishops
 in their Synodical Epistle, written con-
 cerning two Spanish Bishops who had
 been guilty of Idolatry, gives this as a
 general Instruction, that the People who

(u) Εἰ τις πρεσβύτερος ἢ λαϊκὸς χω-
 ρὲς αἰτιασάμενος ἢ δυσπιστήσαντος ἐκείνου πύξῃ. μηδὲν κατηγορησάμενος ἢ
 ἐπισκόπου ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, χωρίζεσθαι. κ. τ. λ.

(x) Ἐκαστὸς πόλει ιερουργεῖν καὶ λαοὶ ὀφείλουσι ὑποκρίσασθαι
 τῇ κατὰ χάριν ἐπισκοπῇ, εἰ μὴ κατηγορήσονται τότε ὡς ἀσεβεῖς
 ἢ ἀδίκαι. τινικαὶ δὲ ἀποδιίσταμένοι αὐτῇ, σὺν εὐνομήσανται.
 Et paulo infra, σημειώσται τὴν παρὰ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν κανόνα δια-
 ριζώμενοι ἀκινδύνως ἀποχρίζειν τὰς κληρικὰς διὰ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν
 αὐτῶν, κατηγορησάμενοι τότε ὡς ἀσεβεῖς. Comp. *Balsa-*
mon upon the 15th Canon of the First and Second Coun-
 cil of Constantinople.

(y) *Lib. 4. c. 44.* Ab omnibus talibus abstinere oportet, adherere vero his, qui Apostolorum Doctrinam custodiunt.

358 A TREATISE against the

fear God and obey his Commands ought to
 separate from a sinful Bishop (z). When
 Nestorius Bishop of Constantinople espou-
 sed Heretical Doctrines, many of his Peo-
 ple and Clergy deserted him ; and the
 People cried out, *We have a King, but
 not a Bishop* (a). And they were com-
 mended for their Behaviour by Celestine
 Bishop of Rome (b), and by Cyril of A-
 lexandria, with a Synod assembled under
 him, in their Synodical Epistle to the
 Monks of Constantinople (c). And the
 great Council of Constantinople, call'd the
First and Second do in their 15th Canon de-
 cree, " That if any should leave the Com-
 " munion of their Bishop for publicly
 " preaching any Heresy condemned by
 " the holy Synods and Fathers, they
 " should not only be free from Canoni-
 " cal Censure for separating themselves,
 " before Synodical Condemnation (d), from

(z) Cypriani *Epist.* 67. Plebs obsequens præceptis
 Dominicis, & Deum metuens, à peccatore præposito se-
 parare se debet.

(a) Ἐπιθεὶα ὁ λαὸς λέγων, βασιλεὺς ἔχομεν, ἐπίσκοπον οὐκ ἔχο-
 μεν. V. Basilii *Diaconi, reliquorumque Monach. Supplic.* in
 Concil. Ephes. *Par.* 1. apud Binii Concil. *Tom.* 2. p. 219.
Confer Epist. Cyrilli ad Celestinum. ibid. p. 178.

(b) *Vid. Celestini Epistolam ad Clerum & Populum*
Constantinop. Ibid. p. 192.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 216.

(d) Πρὸ συνεδικῆς ἀπορρίψεως.

" the

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 359

“ the Bishop so called (e), but should al-
 “ so be thought worthy of that Honour
 “ which is due to the Orthodox, because
 “ they do not condemn a Bishop, but a false
 “ Bishop and a false Teacher (f), i. e. as
Estius expresses it (g), He who perverts
 the Doctrine of Faith, declares himself an
 Enemy to the Church, and thereby divests
 himself of his Authority. Mr. Dodwell round-
 ly asserts, that a Bishop may depose him-
 self (h); and Dr. *Hickes* also maintains
 the same Opinion, and in Defence of it,
 quotes the abovementioned Canon of the
 Council of Constantinople (i). Nay, *Bel-
 larmin* (k) is forced to confess, that even
 a Pope by turning Heretick, deposes
 himself.

Thus the Scriptures and Fathers, and
 our very Adversaries teach us, that Bi-
 shops may depose themselves; and yet
 they teach us, that we ought to obey

(e) Τὸν καλούμενον ἐπίσκοπον.

(f) Οὐ δὲ ἐπίσκοπον, ἀλλὰ ψευδέπισκον καὶ ψευδοδιδά-
 σκαλον κατήγευσεν.

(g) *Ad Heb.* 13. 17.

(h) *Paranes. ad externos*, p. 192. Scipsum Episcopatu
 exuerat per crimina——— talia crimina quæ ipso facto
 illum exuerint——— Ne hic quidem questio fuerit de E-
 piscopo, sed de illo qui olim fuerat, jam vero non sic
 amplius Episcopus.

(i) Dr. *Hickes*, p. 231.

(k) *De Romano Pontifice*, L. 2. c. 30.

Bishops. If then it be one thing to teach that Bishops may depose themselves, and another to teach the Lawfulness of disobeying Bishops: by Parity of Reason to assert, that Kings may depose themselves, is very different from asserting the Lawfulness of Resisting Kings. And if it be so clear a Truth, that Bishops, who receive their Authority from God, do yet depose themselves by teaching Heresy, because they abuse *that Authority to our Destruction, which was given them for our Edification* (1): Then surely it can be no Heresy, to assert that a King, tho' *the Ordinance of God*, Abdicates that Divine Authority which was given him *for the Good of his People*, when he exercises it to their Ruin.

And farther, if some of our Adversaries should still imagine, that it is *Heretical* to teach, that *All Kings may abdicate*: yet even this will not prove, that it is *Heretical* to maintain, that the King of a Limited Monarchy, such as we assert ours to be, may *abdicate*. And therefore, if we should suppose this Opinion, *that the late King James II. abdicated*, to be a Mistake, it will only follow, that those who

(1) 2 Cor. 10. 8.

maintain it are mistaken, as to the Nature of our particular Constitution ; and such Mistakes are not *Heretical*, as I before observed.

Lastly, If some one of the Three abovementioned Principles should, for Argument sake, be supposed to be Heretical, it must be allow'd to be only the Opinion of private Men, and consequently that it cannot justify our Adversaries in separating from our Church ; unless they could shew, that she acknowledges that particular Heretical Principle.

Object. VI. Relates to the Prayers for the King and Royal Family, and to the Occasional Prayers for the Government, during the late War and the late Rebellion ; and it consists of several Particulars.

“ 1. We cannot communicate with
“ you in your publick Worship, because
“ we cannot consent to the Prayers for
“ the Government ; and the *Nation* of a
“ Religious Meeting implies Union and
“ Consent in the Assembly, as far as the
“ Worship extends (*m*) ; and consequent-
“ ly such Consent must be in its own
“ Nature a Term of Communion.

(*m*) *Persuasive to Consideration tendered to the Royalists*, p. 15. Dr. Hickes, p. 183, 195.

Answ. The *Notion* of a Religious Meeting is, an Assembly of Christians met together in one Place, to join together in Prayer to God, or to receive or preach Divine Truths, or to perform some other Religious Duty. And therefore a Man's being present in such a Meeting, implies an Approbation of the Communion, and of those Particulars which the Church has prescribed as Terms of Communion, and an Acknowledgment that he is a Member of the Church; but it does not imply an Assent to every one of the Prayers (n).

Suppose a Congregation met together only to hear a Sermon, and that the Sermon preached to them should happen to be full of Errors: This would be a Religious Meeting, and yet it would not imply that the Congregation received *all* the Preacher's Doctrines.

The Way of Worshipping God with a publick Form, is highly *preferable* to *that* of Worshipping him without such a Form, and *necessary*, when required by Lawful Authority. But to worship God publicly, without such a Form, is not in it self unlawful, and is commonly

(n) *Vid.* Mr. Dodwell's *Further Prospect*, p. 135, &c. practised

practised in the Prayer before Sermon : And Presence at such Publick Worship does not imply an Assent to *all* the Petitions, but only to such, as upon hearing pronounced we approve of. And therefore the *Notion* of a Religious Meeting does not in its own Nature any more imply Consent in the Assembly to *all* the *Prayers*, than it does to *all* the *Doctrines* which shall be delivered by the Preacher.

Reply. " Presence at a Religious Meeting, implies Consent to all the Prayers, " when the Service is regulated by a " Form, so that every one may know " beforehand what they are to expect (o).

Answ. It does not in it self any more imply an Assent to *all* the Prayers, than where the Service is not regulated by a Form : But all that it necessarily implies is, that *none* of the Petitions are Idolatrous or Heretical ; and that *some* of the Petitions in *some* of the particular Offices of the Church, are free from Corruption. And this it implies, barely because a Man's being present at publick Worship, whether performed with or without a Form, argues his Approbation of the Communion. And a Man ought not to

(o) *Persuasive*, &c. p. 15.

approve of a Communion, where he thinks *all* the Petitions in *all* the Offices to be corrupt.

Some of our Clergy use a Prayer before Sermon of their own composing, which is as well known to their respective Parishioners, as the Common-Prayer, and may be look'd upon as a particular and entire Office, as well as the Office of Communion or Burial. Let us put then a Case, which in Probability has often happened. Suppose that some Parishioners should dislike their Minister's Prayer before Sermon, and should publish their Dislike, as the *Nonjurors* do theirs; did, or could any Man ever think that the Presence of such Parishioners, during such a Prayer, implied their Approbation of *all* the Petitions in it? Or can any Man pretend, that they ought to desert the Church, because they do not *intirely*, or perhaps not *at all*, approve of that Prayer of their Pastor?

Our Adversaries farther urge: "Such
" Party-Worship cannot be Communion:
" Comprehension it may be, but not Com-
" munion (p).

(p) Vid. Dr. Hickeys, p. 190.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 365

Answ. It is Communion in all those Prayers, wherein all the Congregation agree. And as to the other Prayers, it is Communion of all the Congregation, except of those few who dissent from them. And Dr. *Hickes* himself in one place (q), calls it *Partial Communion*.

Our Adversaries also pretend (r), that Mr. *Mede* was of their Opinion in this Point; because he says, *Every Prayer presented to God in Holy Assemblies, is not many Prayers of many, but one Prayer of all as one.*

Answ. From hence we may collect, that where one of our Congregations is mixed with *Conforming Nonjurors*, every Prayer, except those for the Government, ought to be accounted the Prayer of that whole Body, as of one Person: And the Government Prayers ought to be esteemed the Prayers of all those present, who acknowledge our Government as of one Person. But that the *Notion* of a Religious Meeting implies assent in the whole Congregation to every Petition, or that Men are bound to absent themselves from all the Prayers, because they cannot as-

(q) *Pag.* 183.

(r) *Ibid.* pag. 191.

sent to some few of them, are Conclusions which Mr. Mede does not appear to have intended, and for which his Words give no Warrant.

2. "The Design of Publick Prayer, is, that
 "all the Congregation may join in every
 "one of the Prayers, and particularly one
 "End of appointing publick Forms is,
 "that the Congregation knowing the
 "Petitions before may the better join in
 "them. Therefore being present at publick Prayer, implies an Assent to all the Prayers (1).

Ans. This is indeed the Design of Ecclesiastical Governours in requiring publick Worship, and in appointing Forms of Common Prayer. But sometimes the known Design of some particular Members of the Congregation is, not to assent to every particular Prayer, but to so many of them as they can in their Conscience approve of, and so to comply with the Design of their Governours, as far as they can lawfully. And this is at present the Case of the *Conforming Nonjurors*. And therefore the Presence of such Persons at publick Worship, does not imply an Assent to all the Prayers.

(1) Ibid. p. 195. *Persuasive to Consideration*. p. 15.

The Design of our Kings in holding Parliaments, is, as King *Edward the First* expressed it in his Writ to command his Clergy to attend one of his Parliaments (t), *That all may approve what all are concerned in*: And, according to the standing Form of the Writs of Summons, the several Members of each House are required to attend, *in order to consent to those Things which shall be ordained by the Parliament* (u). And it has often been manifest beforehand, from the King's Writ, or Proclamation, or otherwise, with what particular Design he has summoned such a Parliament. For Instance, it appears from King *Edward's* abovemention'd Writ, that he called that Parliament to enable him to carry on a War against *France* (w). And

(t) Sicut Lex justissima providi circumspeditione sacrorum principum stabilita hortatur, ut quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbetur; sic & innuit evidenter, ut communibus periculis per remedia provisa communiter obviatur. Vid. Prynnes *Brief Register of Parliament Writs*, p. 6.

(u) Ad faciendum & consentiendum his, quæ tunc ibidem communi Concilio nostro Angliæ contigerit ordinari. Vid. *Coke's 4th Instit.* p. 10. Prynne upon *Coke's 4th Instit.* p. 43, &c.

(w) Sane satis nostis, qualiter Rex Franciæ de terra nostra Vasconiæ nos fraudulenter & cautelose decepit, eam nobis nequiter detinendo. Nunc vero ad expugnationem regni nostri classe maxima & bellatorum copiosa multitudine congregatis, &c.

sometimes Parliaments have been assembled with a known Design, that they should approve of Treaties of Peace or Commerce already made and publick. And it is the Duty of the Members to comply with the King's Design, if it shall appear reasonable to them. But would any one be so wild as from hence to conclude, that the Presence of a Lord in Parliament implied in its own Nature his Assent to *all* the Determinations of that Parliament, even to those from which he openly dissented; especially in Cases where it has been notorious, that some Lords have come to Parliament, with a declared Intention to oppose those Measures, which they knew the King designed they should concur in?

3. "It is not only the *Design* of Publick
 "Worship and Forms of Prayer, but the
 "Command of God and our Ecclesiastical
 "Superiors, that we should *all* join with
 "Mind and Mouth in *every one* of the
 "Prayers; and St. Clement, St. Ignatius,
 "Justin Martyr, and other holy Fathers
 "prescribe the same (x).

Answ. This proves that Men ought, if they can, to assent to *all* the Prayers, but

(x) Dr. Hickee, p. 183, 184, 185.

It does not prove, that Assent to *all* of them is implied in being present at publick Worship, or is a Term of Communion; or that if some of the Congregation cannot join in *every one* of them, therefore they ought not to join in as many as they can with a safe Conscience, but to break off Communion.

The whole of the Case is, that when any Members of a Congregation do not assent to *all* the Prayers, there is certainly a Defect somewhere: either the Church is mistaken in prescribing some corrupt Petitions or those Persons are mistaken in rejecting Petitions, for corrupt, which are really pure. But suppose there should be some Mistake in the Church, it would be a greater Mistake in private Persons, if they should wholly absent themselves from Divine Service in publick, because they could not concur in *some few* of the Prayers, which is plain from this very Argument of our Adversaries. For he who assents to *most* of the Prayers, does in a good Measure comply with the *end* of a Religious Meeting, and obey his Ecclesiastical Governours, tho' *not Entirely*. And it is better to answer that End *in Part*, than to act *quite contrary* to it, and to comply with our Governours as far as we lawfully can, than not to com-

370 A TREATISE against the

ply *at all*. And to assert the contrary, is to maintain this great Absurdity, that when we cannot with a safe Conscience obey our Superiors in *all* Points, we must obey them in *none*.

Christians ought to be of one Mind and Mouth in all other Religious Matters, as well as in Prayer. But where they cannot arrive at perfect Agreement, they must come as near to it, as they can. *Some* of the weaker Christians among the *Romans*, were so mistaken as to think they served God by forbearing some sorts of Meats, and by *esteeming one Day above another*. *Others* thought they honour'd God more by *regarding all Meats and Days alike* (y). Now St. Paul does not therefore command the *Romans* to break off Communion with one another, because they were not all of one Heart and one Soul; but on the contrary requires them to *follow after the Things which make for Peace*, and not to judge one another as superstitious or profane (z). About the same Time the Converts from *Judaism* to *Christianity* circumcised and purified themselves, shaved their Heads, and performed other Parts of ceremonial Worship, prescribed by *Moses's* Law. But tho'

(y) Rom. 14. 2, 5, 14.

(z) Rom. 14. 19, 10, 13.

that

(a)
(b)

that Law was then abolished, and a purer Worship introduced; and tho' the Apostles were most zealous against all Heretical and Idolatrous Errors, yet they were so far from directing the Gentile Christians to divide from the *Jewish* ones on Account of their Mistakes; that the Apostles themselves complied sometimes with the *Jewish* Ceremonies for the sake of Peace (a). And yet the Mistakes of these Judaising Christians were Errors in Religious Doctrines. Whereas, if we should suppose any Errors to be in our Prayers, they are most certainly Errors in Facts, and not in Doctrines of Christianity.

4. " That must be implied in being
" present at publick Worship, or in o-
" ther Words, must be a Term of Com-
" munion, on which the Success of all the
" publick Prayers depends. But discor-
" dant Strings spoil the Harmony, and
" make the *whole* ungrateful to God's Ears.
" And therefore the Efficacy and Force of
" intire Offices of publick Prayer depends
" on all the Congregations being unani-
" mous in *every one* of the Petitions. For our
" Lord says (b), *If two of you shall agree*

(a) V. Acts 16. 3. 21. 24. 18. 18.

(b) Matt. 18. 19.

372 A TREATISE against the

“ on Earth, as touching any thing that
 “ they shall ask, it shall be done for them
 “ of my Father which is in Heaven. Upon
 “ which St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian com-
 “ ment to this Effect; If but two Persons
 “ who are unanimous in Prayer can pre-
 “ vail so much; how much more Force shall
 “ the Prayer of all the Congregation have?
 “ And St. Cyprian also observes, that Dis-
 “ agreement in Prayer is extremely displeasing
 “ to God (c).

Answ. It would have made for the Pur-
 pose of our Adversaries, if our Saviour
 had said; If two of you shall agree as
 touching most of the Prayers contained
 in a certain Form, but as to some few of
 them, one shall assent, and the other dissent,
 my Father will not grant the Prayers to
 which only one assents, nor even the Prayers
 in which both concur. But our Saviour
 no where says or implies any such Mat-
 ter. On the contrary, this Argument of
 our Adversaries, as well as the last, does
 really make strongly against them. And,
 indeed, how should it be otherwise,
 when Men endeavour to defend Separation
 by Pleas for Unanimity? If God be
 displeased with Disagreement in Prayer,

(c) V. Dr. Hickes, p. 183, &c.

then

then he must be most provoked with those who divide most widely. If perfect and universal Unanimity make our Prayers very prevalent with God; then where that cannot be had, the nearer we can rise to it, the more effectual will our Prayers be. St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian rightly concluded, that since where *two* agree in any Prayer, it will be effectual, therefore where *so many more than Two*, as a whole Congregation agree in Prayer, it will be of so much greater Force. And consequently, by the same Rule of Proportion, where All cannot agree in All the Prayers, *the more Persons* agree to pray together, and *the more Prayers* they agree in, the more favourably will God hear them.

Our Adversaries farther urge; "St. Cyprian taxes his People, because when he had required them to pray for certain Lapsers, their Voices were discordant, and their Wills disagreeing, which hindered the Efficacy of their Prayers (d).

Answ. I blame the *Nonjurors* also for the like Fault, and wish, that they would for the future be unanimous in Prayer, as St. Cyprian exhorted his People to be. But can our Adversaries draw any Consequences from hence to support their Cause?

(d) Dr. Hickes, p. 185.

Did St. *Cyprian* leave the Communion of those who did not join in these Prayers? Or did they leave his Communion? Or did he require them to do it? Or did he tell them, that their Prayers would be more effectual, if those who did not concur in these particular Prayers, would wholly absent themselves from publick Worship? No such Matter; notwithstanding that he had enjoined his People to offer up these Prayers in Obedience to a Command, which he had received from God in a Vision (e): So that those who did not join in them, were guilty of violating an expresse and immediate Command of God. And this is an evident Argument, that St. *Cyprian's* Clergy and People did meet and continue together in Divine Service, tho' they did not, even when it was so plainly their Duty, agree in all their Petitions.

5. " Could a Man allow himself such
 " a Liberty of chusing and refusing in
 " publick Worship, he might join with
 " any *Arian* and Popish Congregation :

(e) Scire debetis, sicut Dominus ostendere & revelare dignatur, dictum esse in Visione, *petite & impetrabitis*. Tunc deinde praeceptum plebi assistenti, ut pro quibusdam personis designatis sibi peterent. Epist. *Cypriani* 11.

“ for they have many excellent Prayers (f). ”

Ans. It is astonishing to meet with such an Objection from Men, who pretend to understand perfectly the Nature of Christian Communion. For our Adversaries themselves agree, that both *Arians* and *Papists* are Hereticks. And consequently according to their own Principles, it would not be lawful for us to join with them in publick Worship, tho’ not only *many*, but *every one* of their Prayers were in it self *excellent* and free from Blame.

It was incumbent on our Adversaries to make out, that Assent to *every* Prayer is implied in being present at publick Worship, and is in its own Nature a Term of Communion: And therefore it was sufficient for me to shew, as I have done, that none of their Arguments prove their Point. But for fuller Satisfaction, I shall on our side produce some of Mr. *Dodwell’s* Arguments, with a little Variation, to evince, that Assent to every particular Petition, neither is in its own Nature a Term of Communion, nor ought to be required as such.

(f) Dr. Hickes, p. 190, 191.

“ If Assent to every Prayer were a
 “ Term of Communion, we should be
 “ bound to separate from all those Churches
 “ from any of whose Prayers we dissented:
 “ and consequently we should be often
 “ obliged to communicate with no Church
 “ at all. Because on account of the Cor-
 “ ruption and Mistakes of Governours and
 “ Subjects, extrinsick Changes of Persons
 “ and Circumstances, and doubtful Titles
 “ which are unavoidable in a long Suc-
 “ cession, it is hardly possible, that Pray-
 “ ers made in the Name of any great
 “ Body should be such, as every Indi-
 “ vidual can assent to (g). And there-
 “ fore there is no Communion in the
 “ World, where the like Pretence for Se-
 “ paration may not be found (h); par-
 “ ticularly there was a strong Pretence
 “ of this Nature for separating from the
 “ Communion of the Church of *England*
 “ in the Reign of the late King *James*
 “ *the Second*, when we used that Petiti-
 “ on in the Litany, *that God would keep*
 “ *and strengthen him in the true worshipping*
 “ *of Him*: for which the Papists upbrai-
 “ ed us, pretending, that thereby we

(g) *Further Prospect*, p. 70, 71.

(h) *Ibid.* p. 44.

“ owned the *Popish* Religion, then pro-
 “ fessed by him, to be *the true worship-*
 “ *ping of God*, and that we pray’d God
 “ *to keep and strengthen him in it*; yet no
 “ one then or since ever thought it a suf-
 “ ficient Ground for them to separate
 “ from the Church, who did so under-
 “ stand that Petition (i).

And, by the Way, I would desire the
Nonconforming Nonjurors to tell me, whe-
 ther they do not now pray in their Litany,
 that *God would keep and strengthen the*
Pretender in the true Worshipping of him;
 whether several of their People do not,
 as I have been inform’d they do, judge
 that to be a *false* and a *curfing* Prayer;
 and how they can defend those Peo-
 ple, in being present where that Prayer
 is offered, or their Leaders, in suffering
 them to be present when they do not
 assent to *all* the Prayers? And, I believe,
 that what they say to justify themselves in
 this Point, would as well justify their
 conforming to our Liturgy, supposing us
 to be so mistaken, as they falsely ima-
 gine.

To return. “ God desires, that all well-
 “ meaning Persons should be saved; and he

(i) *Ibid.* p. 22,

“ has

“ has founded his Church, that they may
 “ be saved in her Communion, and by the
 “ Means of Salvation, which are ordinari-
 “ ly confined to her ; and God ought not
 “ to be supposed to have made his Esta-
 “ blishments inconsistent, and no Way
 “ answerable to his own Design in making
 “ them. Since then it is next to mo-
 “ rally impossible, that *whole* Offices of
 “ Prayers should agree in *every* Particular,
 “ with the private Sentiments of *every*
 “ *single* Communicant of a great Body
 “ of Men : it is not reasonable to ima-
 “ gine, that God has made Assent to all
 “ publick Prayers necessary to Communi-
 “ on with the Church, and thereby cut
 “ off *from* her Communion several well-
 “ meaning Persons in all Ages and Coun-
 “ tries, whom he designed to save *in* her
 “ Communion (k).

“ If it be in its own Nature necessary
 “ to Communion to assent to every pub-
 “ lick Prayer, of how great or little Im-
 “ portance soever the Matter of that Prayer
 “ be ; then there can be no such Thing as
 “ Catholick Communion. For then eve-
 “ ry particular Church would have Terms
 “ of Communion proper to her self, be-

(k) *Ibid.* p. 78, &c.

“ cause

“ cause every Church has different Prayers,
 “ and so the Terms of Communion would
 “ be in a manner infinite. Besides, parti-
 “ cular Churches have often such Prayers,
 “ as the Members of other Churches can-
 “ not assent to, *viz.* such Prayers as are
 “ made for the Advantage of one Body,
 “ to the Prejudice of another. For In-
 “ stance, whenever the *Swedish* and *Danish*
 “ Civil Governours are at War with one
 “ another, their Churches too must divide
 “ from each others Communion, barely
 “ because the *Swedes* are obliged to pray
 “ for Success against the *Danes*, and the
 “ *Danes* against the *Swedes* (1).

And by the Way, we may, by apply-
 ing this Argument, see the Weakness of
 most of the Objections of our Adversaries.
 Suppose a *Dane* should be sent Ambassador
 into *Sweden*, and should thus argue against
 communicating in the Prayers of the *Swedish*
 Church. *That the Congregation ought*
to be of ONE Mind in ALL their Prayers;
 and therefore he could not join in *any* of
 their Prayers, because he could not assent
 to their Prayers for Success against *Den-*
mark; which were *corrupt, unrighteous,*
curfing, blasphemous Prayers; and polluted all

(1) *Case in Fact*, p. 112. &c.

the Holy Offices, wherein they were used, and dishonoured and affronted God; and that he should think it less bairous to be present, where Ave Maries were said (m); that Praying was Teaching, and to bring his Servants to the Swedish Churches, would be to teach them, that the Danish Cause was unjust (n). I believe most Men would think, that all this proved nothing but the Dane's violent Heat and Uncharitableness. And, in short, the Consequence of this Doctrine must be, that, where-ever there is a War, there must be a Schism.

6. "The Church of England has made
"an Assent to all her publick Prayers a
"Term of Communion. For she com-
"mands All her Members to say Amen to
"all the Prayers (o).

Ans. The Church enjoins several Observances, which she does not enjoin as Conditions of Communion. So she commands all manner of Persons present at Church to Kneel, when the general Confession, Litany, and other Prayers are read; and to make such Answers to the publick Prayers, as are appointed in the Book of Common-Prayer (p). But it would be

(m) Dr. Hickes, p. 7, 8. (n) Ibid. p. 178. (o) Ibid. p. 193, 311. Persuasive to Consideration, p. 15. (p) V. Canon 18.

absurd to imagine, that she insists upon Kneeling at every particular Prayer, and making every particular Response as Terms of Communion. " In like manner she " desires and commands, that we should " assent to all, and consequently to these " Government Prayers; yet she does not " command an Assent to these Prayers as " a Term of Communion; because it is " notorious, that the *Conforming Nonju-* " *rors* dissent from them, and publicly " signify their Dissent by not saying *Amen* " to them; and when the Signification " of a Dissent from particular Prayers is " known to, but not censured by the Go- " vernours of the Church, it is plain that " an Assent to such Prayers, is not insist- " ed on by them as a Condition of Com- " munion (q).

Our Adversaries urge two Arguments to confirm, that Obedience to every one of the Laws of the Church is a Term of Communion. The *first* is, " If the " Church command a wicked Thing, you " are no longer to be a Member of it. " This the Writers of the Church of " *England* always granted to the Dissenters; " they owned, if the Dissenters could

(q) *Further Prospect*, p. 69.

" shew

“ shew, that the Church impos’d upon
 “ them any unlawful Terms of Commu-
 “ nion, or if they could prove, *that any*
 “ *of our Prayers were unrighteous, and not*
 “ *fit to be offer’d to God*; they then con-
 “ fessed, that the Dissenters Separation
 “ was Lawful, and no Schism: For they
 “ acknowledged that an unlawful Imposi-
 “ tion is a sufficient Ground for Separa-
 “ tion (r).

Answ. We ought not to continue Mem-
 bers of a Church, if she should enjoin us
 to be guilty of Infidelity, Idolatry, Here-
 sy or Schism. For thereby she would cut
 herself off from Communion with the Ca-
 tholick Church. But there are some other
 wicked Things, which if she should thro’
 mistake command, for Instance, to join in a
 Prayer which implies a Falshood in Fact,
 and if she should not insist on this as a
 Condition of Communion, we are not
 bound to forsake her Communion. And
 our Adversaries in saying the contrary,
 run into several Absurdities. *First*, they
 must suppose, that the Canons and Offices
 of every Church with which a Man can
 lawfully communicate, are perfectly free
 from all Mistakes, not only as to Do-

(r) Dr. Hickes, p. 311.

ctrine, but as to Matters of Fact; which is more than even the Church of *Rome*, tho' pretending to Infallibility, arrogates to her self. *Next* their Opinion plainly implies, that if our Church-Governours should be so unfortunate, as thro' Mistake to prescribe some *one* Thing unlawful, tho' they do not insist on it as a Term of Communion, we must nevertheless immediately reject their Authority in *all other* Points whatsoever. Now it is strange to hear this from those who pretend to be so averse to Resistance to Superiors. Bishops may, and others ought, to overlook the Mistakes of private Christians. The Apostles themselves bore with, and commanded others to bear with, the Errors of the first *Jewish* Converts, and of the weak Christians among the *Romans*. But according to our Adversaries, private Christians ought not to shew the least Indulgence to the Misapprehensions of their Ecclesiastical Governours; tho' they are *Men* as well as their People, and sometimes subject to be deceived, when their Intentions are never so good. *Thirdly*, Our Adversaries are as severe to the Mistakes of the *People*, as of the Governours of the Church. For* if we be bound to forsake the Church, whenever she orders any thing in any respect unlawful; then

then whenever any private Man does, thro' some Misapprehension, falsely imagine any Rule of the Church to be unlawful, which sometimes proves to the Case of the sincerest Christians, he must desert her Communion. St. *Austin* said of himself, *I may err, but I will not be a Heretick*. But according to our Adversaries, if any Christian, thro' want of Learning, or weakness of Judgment, fall into one of these Errors about Ecclesiastical Constitutions, he will be under a fatal Necessity of turning a Schismatick. Lastly, Our Adversaries condemn the Practice of our Saviour himself, and his Apostles. The *Jews* required several superstitious Rites and Ceremonies; and particularly they imposed this most wicked Command, not to own our Saviour to be the Messiah; and agreed, *That if any Man did confess, that Jesus was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue* (f). And yet during our Saviour's Life here upon Earth, he did not forsake the *Jewish* Communion. And we find in the *Acts*, that his Apostles continued to communicate with them after his Decease. But our Adversaries assert what implies, that we ought to forsake

(f) John 9. 22.

the Communion of a Church for prescribing some few Commands pretendedly unlawful, tho' she does not impose them as Terms of Communion.

Thus I have fully shewn the Absurdity of this Assertion, *that if the Church commanded any unlawful Thing, or if any of her Prayers were not fit to be offered to God, we ought not to continue Members of her.* And this is more than I needed to have done; since our Adversaries have brought no other Proof, except another precarious Assertion, *viz. That the Writers of the Church of England always granted this Point to the Dissenters.* Our Adversaries would have done kindly to have produced the Writers who grant this, and then we might have considered, what they say. I am sure *some* of our Writers are of a contrary Opinion. Dr. Claget, whose Merit and Learning are well known, after having defended our praying in the Litany against *sudden Death*, concludes, "He
" that thinks himself not to stand in need
" of those Acts of Self-Examination, by
" which good Men improve the Warn-
" ings of Death, let him suspend his
" Act, and refuse to join with us, when
" we pray God to *deliver us from sudden*
" *Death* (t)." In like manner, having

(t) Vid. among the London Cases against the Dissent-
ers,

defended our Reading Lessons out of the *Apocryphal Books*, in our Churches, he concludes, "There is no *Apocryphal Lesson* read in our Churches upon any *Lord's Day* in the Year, and so there is not this Pretence against Communion with us upon the *Lord's-Day* (u)." The Church of *England* commands our Attendance at publick Worship, when the *Apocryphal Lessons* are read, unless we have a reasonable Cause of Absence. And Dr. *Clagett* judged, that they who believed this to be an unlawful Command, had no Pretence to break off Communion entirely with her, but ought to join with her in publick Worship, when those Lessons were not read, and to obey some of her Commands, tho' they could not conscientiously obey all of them. Bishop *Williams* also agrees, "That We are not to separate from a Church for unlawful Things, unless they be imposed as necessary Terms of Communion, or be of so hainous a Nature, as to unchurch a Church, and affect the Vitals of Religion (w)." Thus we

ers, *Quarto*, Dr. *Clagett's Answer to their Objections against the Common Prayer*, p. 30.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 33.

(w) *Ibid.* *Bishop Williams's Case of Lay-Communion with the Church of England*, p. 19, &c.

see

see what was the Opinion of those two learned Writers against the Dissenters, in the Reign of King Charles II. And I do not know, that any others of our Writers granted, that we ought to separate from a Church for EVERY unlawful Prescription. And I am persuaded, that none of them ever did, for this Reason; because I cannot perceive that they had any occasion to grant it, since the old Non-Conformists did not demand it, but on the contrary maintained, "That to join in
 " Nothing, because they could not join
 " in all Things, was a dividing (i. e. a
 " Schismatical) Practice: that the deny-
 " ing Assent to all and every thing con-
 " tained in the Common Prayer, does
 " not gainsay the Lawfulness of partak-
 " ing in that Worship, it being found
 " in the main: that we ought not to
 " separate from a Church for every nor
 " many Corruptions, but for Heresy and
 " Idolatry, and imposing such Laws of
 " Communion, as there is a Necessity of
 " doing or approving Things unlawful:
 " Because such a Separation is not war-
 " ranted by Scripture, but contrary to
 " the Practice of Christ and his Apo-
 " stles, and supposes greater Perfection
 " than this present State will admit of,
 " and consequently destroys all Commu-

" nion: and because partaking in any
 " Divine Worship, which is holy and
 " good for the Matter, and passable in
 " the Mode *for the Main*, doth not in-
 " volve a Man in the Blame of some
 " sinful Defects therein, to which he
 " consents not, and which he cannot
 " redress: and because Corruptions, tho'
 " foreknown, do not yet make those
 " that are present guilty of them." Bi-
 " shop Williams (x) shews this to be the
 " Doctrine of the *Non-Conformists* from a
 " Multitude of their Writers. And he par-
 " ticularly observes (y), " That it is *uni-*
 " *versally* own'd, that there is no just
 " Ground of Separation from a Church,
 " unless you find in her Blasphemy (*i. e.*
 " *Herefy*) or Idolatry or Persecution, *i. e.*
 " such Persecution as forces Men to leave
 " the Communion."

The *Second* Argument of our Adver-
 saries to prove, that *Obedience to every one*
of the Church's Laws is a Term of Commu-
nion, is, that if we do not obey *Every*
Command of the Church, we thereupon
actually cease to be Members of her, or
 as it is worded, *if we will except where*

(x) Ibid. p. 16, &c.

(y) Ibid. p. 11.

she gives us no Power to except, We can have no Obligation of Conscience to such an Authority: And we may thrust our selves into such Company when they mind us not, but we cannot be said truly to be of their Communion in any Ecclesiastical Sense (z).

Ans. This must either mean, that if the Church impose any unlawful Command, she intirely forfeits her Authority to impose lawful Commands; and then this is the same Argument with the last, which has been refuted already. Or else it must mean, that we cannot reject the Authority of the Church in any One Point, without denying it in All. And this is the Sense, in which I take our Adversaries to understand it. And if it be, the Assertion is false and precarious. God's Dominion and Perfection being infinite, he cannot command any thing but what he has Authority to command, and consequently to reject his Authority in part, is to reject it intirely: or as St. James expresses it, *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one Point, he is guilty of all* (a). But Mens Power is

(z) Vid. *Case in Fact*, p. 108.

(a) James 2. 10.

limited, and they are subject to Error and Passion. And therefore they may happen to stretch their Authority beyond its due Bounds, or to command Things in their own Nature unlawful. And when they do so, to refuse to be govern'd by them in *such* Respects, is not to disown their Authority in *others*: much less is it a Desertion of Ecclesiastical Communion to decline complying with our Ecclesiastical Governours in some *few* Points, which are not essential, and are thought by us to be unlawful, while at the same time we obey them in all those Points which they insist upon as Terms of Communion. And it is agreed, that a Man may disobey the sinful Commands of his Civil Governours, and yet own their Authority in lawful Matters, and continue a Member of the Body Politick; and our Adversaries neither have shewn, nor can shew, why the same should not be as true in Ecclesiastical Matters, as it is in Civil.

7. Another Argument, that we cannot be present at our Churches, without assenting to the Government Prayers, is this. "These and the like Expressions in the Liturgy; O Christ hear us; favourably with Mercy hear our Prayers: refer to every particular Petition which
" is

" is put up to God, and consequently to
" the Government Prayers among the
" rest (b).

Answ. When I join in such Petitions, I
can never be understood by God or Man,
to mean by OUR Prayers, those which
notoriously were NOT MY Prayers, nor
in such a general Expression to approve
of such particular Prayers, from which,
when they were separately offered, I
openly dissented.

8. " If we do not assent to every one of
" the Prayers, we tell God a Falshood,
" when we say in St. Chrysostom's Prayer,
" *that God has given us Grace at this*
" *Time, with ONE ACCORD* to make
" OUR COMMON Supplications unto
" him (c).

Answ. It is a manifest Violence to these
Words also to suppose that we can mean
by them, *Supplications from which we dis-*
sented, and which consequently were not
Ours, nor Common, nor made with One Ac-
cord. It has sometimes happened, that
the Minister has prayed for Rain, when
some of his Congregation have thought
fair Weather more seasonable. Yet did

(b) Dr. Hickes, p. 309.

(c) Dr. Hickes, p. 9.

any Man ever imagine, that such Persons were guilty of Falshood for saying *Amen* to this Prayer of St. *Chrysostom*?

But to cut this Matter short; If those who shall be so scrupulous as not to be satisfied with these Answers, should forbear joining in the Petitions mentioned in the two last Objections, as well as in the Government Prayers, these Objections will be intirely removed.

9. "The Government Prayers are solemn *Curses* against the Pretender. For to *curse* is to *pray against*. And will you be present at those Congregations, where the Priest does the same sinful Action which *Balak* tempted *Balaam* to commit, and violates St. *Paul's* Command (d), *to bless and curse not* (e).

Answ. This Argument would, as I before observed, as well prove that the *Swedish* Prayers for Success against the *Danes* are Curses, and that therefore the *Danes* ought not to communicate with the *Swedish* Church. This Argument indeed seems to infer, that we ought not to *pray against* any Men; whereas the Church of God, and particularly the Re-

(d) Rom. 12. 14.

(e) Dr. *Hickes*, p. 7, 176, 181.

formed Church of *England*, has always pray'd against the Enemies of the Church and State. And it is certain, that all *Praying against* others is not prohibited: but either the *Praying against* them in an unlawful Manner. For Instance, when we *pray against* their *Persons*, rather than their wicked *Devices*. Now in this respect we are not guilty of *Cursing*. For the Form of our Government Prayers is the very same that it was before the *Revolution*. Or else it is prohibited to *pray against* those *Persons*, whom we *know* we ought to *pray for*. Thus it was Death, by the *Jewish Law* (f) for a Man to *curse or revile his Father or Mother*, and much more undoubtedly to *pray against* them. And this was the Sin which *Balak* tempted *Balaam* to commit, viz. to *curse Israel*, after he *knew* he ought to *pray for* them, i. e. after God himself had expressly prohibited him to *curse them*, because they were *blessed* (g). But a Man would not have deserved Death, who should have *pray'd against* his Father, not knowing him to be such, but mistaking him for a Stranger and an Enemy.

(f) Exod. 21. 17.

(g) Num. 22. 12.

And

And indeed, when we sincerely apprehend those Persons, whom we ought really to *pray for*, to be unjust Enemies to our Church and State, to *pray against* them is so far from being the *Cursing* prohibited by Scripture, that it is our Duty while we lie under that Error. And farther, it can never be any Man's Duty to join in sinful *Cursing*: but it will be a Man's Duty to be present where others *curse*, if his Presence be required by those who have Authority over him. And therefore supposing for Argument sake, what is evidently untrue, that our Prayers against the Pretender were sinful *Curses*, yet it would not from thence follow, that our *Non-jurors* may absent themselves from our Churches, since it is their Duty on other Accounts to come thither.

10. " Your Prayers are *false*, styling
 " him King, who is not King, and *un-
 " righteous*, because they are put up a-
 " gainst plain Right, and a rightful Prince;
 " and therefore, being contrary to God's
 " essential *Justice* and *Truth*, affront and
 " dishonour him more, than Prayers made
 " to Saints and Angels, or than offering
 " a Bullock with Blemish; and are as
 " execrable in their Nature, as those
 " Persons

“ Persons were in their Principles, who
“ called Good Evil, and Evil Good (b).

Answ. A heavy Charge indeed, but yet not much more heavy than a *Dane* might bring against the *Swedish* Prayers. But, *First*, Supposing for Argument sake, that God is dishonoured by our Prayers; I answer; Tho’ it can never be our Duty to join in dishonouring God; yet it may be to be present where God is dishonoured by others. So Servants may be obliged in Obedience to their Master to attend him; when he swears profanely or otherwise affronts God. Those who sleep at Church dishonour God, and the Prayer of the Wicked is an Abomination to him; and yet we are often obliged to be present at Divine Service, when some sleep there, and when others notoriously immoral join in the Publick Prayers.

Secondly, Our Prayers would really dishonour God, if there were a *Falsbood* in them, and we *knew* it to be a *Falsbood*: or if we prayed against plain *Right* in exprefs Terms, or against a Prince whom we *believed* to be *Rightful*. For the former Prayers would shew, that we thought

(b) Dr. Hickes, p. 7, 8, 175, &c.

we could deceive God, and the latter, that we thought, God would favour Injustice.

But it is no Affront to God to offer up to him *false* Prayers, when we *believe* them to be *true*. For Instance, when a King dies, those who are at a Distance, and ignorant of his Death, continue to put up Prayers which suppose him to be a-live. Yet no one can say, that such Prayers, tho' in themselves *false*, and *contrary to God's essential Truth*, dishonour God, but only imply, that Men are fallible: Much less can any one affirm, that in such a Case, those of the Congregation, who may happen to know that the King is dead, ought upon hearing him pray'd for, to leave the Church.

Nor is it an Affront to God to pray against a Prince, who has really a *Right*, but whom we sincerely *think* to have *none*. On the contrary, while we truly *believe* another to be our *Rightful* Prince, we are bound to put up Prayers for him, and consequently against our *Rightful* Prince; tho' such Prayers be materially *contrary to God's essential Justice*.

The *first* Comparison our Adversaries make of our Government Prayers, is to the *Popish* Liturgy; and from thence they argue thus. "Pollution in Worship was one of the chief Causes of
"our

“ our separating from the Church of
 “ Rome. But one had better be present,
 “ where Prayers are offered to Saints and
 “ Angels, which is only forbidden by a
 “ positive Law; than where God is af-
 “ fronted by such *false* and *unrighteous*
 “ Prayers (i).

Answ. I have already observed, that
 our Adversaries themselves allow the Pa-
 pists to be *Hereticks*: and therefore it
 would not be lawful to join in their
 Prayers, tho' every one of them were
 pure, and free from Pollution; because
 by joining in their publick Worship, we
 should approve of their Heretical Com-
 munion. And farther, the Pollution of
 the *Romish* Worship was *general*; most
 of their Prayers being corrupted, either
 in respect of the Object to which they
 were directed, *viz.* Saints, Angels, the
 Host, or Images; or on account of the
 Things prayed for; or of the erroneous
 Doctrines acknowledged in the Prayers.
 In one respect the Pollution was *univer-*
sal, and directly affected every particular
 Prayer, *viz.* because the Prayers were
 couch'd in an unknown Tongue. *Lastly,*
 the Pollution of *some* of the *Popish* Prayers

(i) *Dr. Hickes, p. 7, 8, 176, 199.*

was an *Idolatrous* Pollution, and consequently render'd it unlawful to join in any of the Prayers, tho' some of them had been perfect and pure. For we must not have any Religious Communion with Idolaters, any more than with Hereticks. The Worship paid by the Papists to the Images of God, and to the Host, is *idolatrous*, and contrary to the *Second Commandment*. The Prayers offered to Saints and Angels are *Idolatrous*, and give that Glory to the *Creature* which is due only to the *Creator*; because they at least imply, that Saints and Angels are omniscient. And the Mistake in such Prayers is in one of the *Fundamental* Doctrines of natural Religion, if the Doctrines of God's Attributes be *Fundamental*. And therefore such Worship and Prayers are clearly forbidden by the Law of *Nature* and *Reason*, and not only by a *positive* Law, as our Adversaries falsely maintain. But it is not pretended, that our Government Prayers are either *Idolatrous*, or corrupt as to the *Form* or *Object* of them, or generally corrupt in any other Respect. And the Mistakes alledged to be in them relate chiefly to *Facts*. And supposing that there is a Mistake in *Doctrine*, I have shewn it not to be in a *Fundamental Doctrine*.

And here I cannot forbear observing, that our Adversaries have no Reason to blame those, who suspect them to be *Popishly* affected, and that they are not in earnest when they call the Papists Hereticks; since they take so many Occasions to speak favourably of *Popery*. For Instance, they affirm, that the *Popish* Invocation of Saints and Angels is only forbidden by a *positive* Law; and they openly prefer *that* Worship, which is really *Idolatrous*, and which they own to be *corrupt* and *Heretical*, before *ours*, which they can only charge with a supposed Mistake concerning the Right of a temporal Prince. And they also represent the Usurpation of the Pope, as a far less grievous Sin, than for a Rightful Lay Prince to deprive Bishops for the highest Offences against the State (*k*).

The *Second* Comparison is this. "Your Prayers are a greater Abomination to God, than that of offering a Bullock with Blemish, because the Transgression of a *moral* Precept is more hainous than that of a *positive* one (*l*).

Ans. If our Adversaries here mean, as they seem to do, the offering of a Bullock, which was *known* to have a Blemish :

(*k*) Vid. Dr. Hickes, p. 117, 118, 119.

(*l*) Dr. Hickes, p. 175.

mish: I answer, that to transgress a *moral* Precept through *Ignorance* is not so *hainous*, as *wilfully* to break a *positive* one. Nay, as I have just now observed, since we sincerely believe our King to be rightful, tho' we should be mistaken, yet our Prayers for him would be such as God requires of us, while we lie under that Mistake, and consequently could not be an *Abomination* to God.

But if our Adversaries mean, (as to make the Cases parallel, they ought to mean), the offering of a Bullock which had *really* a Blemish, but was *thought* to be a perfect one: I answer, that to present such an Offering was, if *any* Sin, not a *hainous* one, but only a Sin of Ignorance, and such a Sin as in all probability did not hinder God's gracious Acceptance of the Offering. For in a like Case, when a *Multitude* of the People of Israel had eaten the Passover otherwise than it was written, and Hezekiah prayed the Lord to pardon every one that prepared his Heart to seek God, tho' he were not cleansed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary, the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the People (m). And if he who ignorantly of-

(m) 2 Chron. 30. 18, 19, 20.

ferred a Bullock with a *Blemish*, were not guilty of a *hainous Sin*, it would be strange to imagine, that others who might be at the same time offering up *pure Sacrifices* in the Temple, and might perhaps perceive the Defect in this Bullock, would have been immediately obliged to have quitted the Temple and the *pure Sacrifices*, in which they were joining, in order to shew their Detestation of an *impure Sacrifice*, in which they had no Concern.

The *last Comparison* is thus express'd.
 " These Prayers are as *execrable* in their
 " Nature, as the Prophet says (*n*), those
 " Persons were in their Principles, who
 " called *Good Evil, and Evil Good ; Bitter*
 " *Sweet, and Sweet Bitter ; Light Darkness,*
 " *and Darkness Light (o).*"

Ans. If these *Prayers* were as like such *Principles*, as our Adversaries represent them : then as it is not lawful for me presently to quit the Church, when a Person of such *Principles*, or one whom I apprehend to be such, comes into it : So neither may I break off Communion for every Prayer in the Liturgy, which I imagine to be faulty. But these *Prayers* would not be at all like to such *Principles*,

(*n*) *Isaiah* 5. 20.

(*o*) *Dr. Hickes, p. 175.*

even tho' they were Prayers materially *false and unrighteous*. For the Persons against whom the Prophet denounces a *Woe*, were such as *wilfully and knowingly* called *Evil Good, and Good Evil*; not such as *happened* to do so through *Ignorance*; as St. Paul did, and therefore *obtained Mercy*, instead of falling under a *Woe* (p). They were such Persons as confounded the Nature of *Things*, not such as were Mistaken in *Facts*. Lastly, They were such Persons as confounded *Things*, the Nature whereof was *plain* and obvious, and might as easily be understood, as the Difference between *Bitter and Sweet, Light and Darkneſs*; not such as were only deceived in Matters of the *niceſt* and most doubtful Nature, which the Titles of Kings sometimes are. Thus I have supposed, for Argument sake, the Matter of *ſome* of our Prayers to be unlawful, and the Title of our Prince (which is really most clear and certain) to be such as our Adversaries represent it: and yet it appears, that this Comparison does by no means hold good, even upon such a Supposition.

(p) 1 Tim. 1. 13.

11. "By the Canons, a Clergyman is
 " to be Deposed, who *speaks but reproach-*
 " *fully of the King.* And can a King suf-
 " fer a greater *Reproach*, than when his
 " Subjects presume to *pray against him?*
 " And can it be lawful to be present,
 " where my King is abused and re-
 " *proached (q) ?*"

Answ. Tho' a Clergyman should de-
 serve to be Deposed, yet it will not be
 lawful for me to break off Communion
 with him, till he is actually Deposed.
 And since, as I have proved, it may be in
 some Cases our Duty to be present even
 where God is dishonoured ; much more is
 it our Duty to attend the Divine Service
 of the Church, tho' we should apprehend
 that some Things therein tend to the
 Dishonour of our *Temporal Prince.*

12. " By assisting at these immoral
 " Prayers, you bring your self into the
 " Temptation of growing by degrees to
 " approve of them ; in which Tempta-
 " tion you have no reason to expect God
 " should support you (r)."

Answ. This is to beg the Question, and
 to suppose, instead of proving, that when

(q) Dr. Hickes, p. 181, 176.

(r) Dr. Hickes, p. 176, 177.

it is my Duty on other Accounts to attend Divine Service, I am bound not to do it on account of some few Prayers, in my Opinion immoral. For if I be bound to attend in such a Case, it is notorious, that *I have reason to expect, that God will support me, and not suffer me to be tempted above what I am able.*

13. "Since Reading is Teaching, Praying must for the same Reason be so too. And then with what Conscience can you bring your Children and Domesticks to Church, to be there taught Doctrines and Practices dangerous to the Souls of Men (s)?"

Answ. Our Government Prayers do indeed consequentially, tho' not directly, teach, that our present Government is Rightful. But supposing them, for Argument sake, to be erroneous in this Point, there is certainly no *Heresy* in them, as I have already shewn: and therefore the *Nonjurors* must do in this, as in other Cases, when they are obliged to be present where Errors are preached, *viz.* caution their Children and Domesticks against them.

But our Adversaries particularly object, that our Prayers on the 5th of November

(s) Dr. Hickes, p. 178.

imply,

imply, that the present Government is rightful on the Principle of the Abdication; because therein *we bless God for making all Opposition fall before his late Majesty, till he became our King.* Now I might answer, that I have already proved, that the Opinion, that a King may Abdicate, is not Heretical. But there is no Ground for this Objection. For in those Prayers we give Thanks, not because the *English resisted the late King James*, but because they *did not resist the late King William*, or did not resist him successfully. Now those Men who thought it *sinful to resist King James*, might think it *lawful*, and perhaps their *Duty not to be active for him*, but to leave him to defend himself as well as he could against the Prince of Orange, and the foreign Forces which he brought with him. Nay farther, if the Prayers had expressly given Thanks, because the late King *James* was partly expelled by the Resistance which some *English* made to him, even this would not necessarily have implied that we thought that Resistance of theirs lawful. For we may praise God for having brought Good to pass by such particular Means and Instruments, without acknowledging that those Instruments were, as to themselves, justifiable in using those Means. God foretold, that he would raise

Cyrus, and make him a great Conqueror, to enable him to restore the *Jews* to their own Country, and give Orders for the Rebuilding *Jerusalem* and the Temple (1). Now when the *Jews* saw this come to pass, they might lawfully bless God for *Cyrus's* Conquests. And this they might do, tho' they had known, that the Cause of his undertaking those Conquests was not just, but only a Thirst after Power and Glory.

If any one shall still scruple being present while these Prayers on the 5th of *November* are read; I add, that these Prayers are only used one Day in the Year, and that on that Day the *Conforming Nonjurors* absent themselves from Publick Worship, without being called to account for it; which shews, that their Attendance on that Day is not insisted on as a Term of Communion.

14. "You do not abstain from all Appearance of Evil, but harden the Revolutionists in their Error, and lead others into it (u)."

Answ. I cannot see what likelihood there can be, that the *Nonjurors* by attending our publick Worship should appear to approve of the Prayers, since it is no-

(1) *Isaiah* 45. 1---4. 44. 28.

(u) *Dr. Hickes*, p. 178, 179, 176.

torious,

torious, that they do not approve of them. On the contrary, it is more likely, that if the Revolutionists were in an Error, a *Nonjuror's* Presence at publick Worship would be a Means to draw them from it, because by his known Dissent, he would continually warn them of it, and as it were protest against it. And from hence we may observe, that we are secure of the Goodness of *our* Cause, and that our Adversaries seem to distrust the Goodness of *theirs*, because we invite them to our Churches, and they are afraid to come thither.

But allowing it to be possible, that if the *Nonjurors* frequented our Churches, it might perhaps occasion some to imagine, that they acknowledged the present Government: Are there not several Ways to obviate this pretended Danger? Do they not continually protest against the Doctrine of Resisting Kings by their Nonjurancy, by their Actions and Writings? May they not also find out other Means to prevent People's being thus mistaken? Or are they obstinately resolved to use no other Method, but that of breaking the Peace and Unity of the Church?

Lastly, Should it happen that in some Cases Offence should be taken at the *Nonjurors* coming to our Churches; yet they

ought to resort thither notwithstanding, and to leave others to God's Providence. For the Danger of offending is a good Argument against doing an Action, which we are at Liberty to do or to forbear, but not against doing an Action, which, whatever Appearance it may have, is really not only innocent, but necessary, and if it should offend others, it would be an Offence *taken*, not *given*. And therefore for the *Nonjurors* on such Pretences as these to absent themselves, is knowingly to commit *Evil* to avoid the Appearance of it, and to fall into *certain Sin* themselves, *for fear* they should by *chance* lead others into it. And it is no more justifiable, than it was in some of our old Dissenters to forbear receiving the Eucharist in our Churches, for fear they should by kneeling at it seem to Worship the Elements; or than it would be in a Clergyman, to neglect reading the Lessons appointed by the Rubrick to be taken out of the Apocrypha, lest it shou'd occasion some of the common People to mistake them for Scripture.

15. " It is as unlawful for us to assist
 " at your Prayers, as it was for the Pri-
 " mitive Christians to be present at the
 " Idol Feasts. For their Idolatrous Friends
 " and Neighbours knew they believed an
 " *Idol* to be nothing, and did not intend
 " thereby

“ thereby to give the Idol any Wor-
 “ ship (w).”

Ans. These two Cases are very different. The Persons here alluded to were some *Corinthians*, who, as we may collect from what *St. Paul* writes against them (x), were not barely present at the Idol Feasts, but took upon them to eat Meats offered to Idols. And this they alledged to be lawful; because they knew, that an Idol was Nothing, and that what was Nothing could not pollute Meats which were God's good Creatures. Now this was really joining in the Worship paid to Idols, which it is not lawful on any Pretence to do.

Or should our Adversaries think, that the eating Meats offered to Idols was only forbidden; because it gave Offence to others? I answer, that this Case is very different from that of the *Nonjurors* coming to Divine Service in our Church, which being a necessary Duty, is not to be forborn for fear of offending; as the eating Meats offered to Idols ought to have been, because that was, according to this Supposition, intirely indifferent in it self.

(w) *Dr. Hickes*, p. 179.

(x) 1 *Cor.* 8, and 10.

16. " St. *Ambrose*, in his Second Em-
 " bassy from *Valentinian* the Younger to
 " *Maximus* the Usurper, would not (as
 " *Paulinus* tells us in his Life) communi-
 " cate with *Maximus*, who had killed his
 " Master *Gratian*, nor (as he himself told
 " *Valentinian*, whose Ambassador he was)
 " with the Bishops who communicated
 " with him, because he could not give his
 " Assent to the Prayers which they of-
 " fered in the Church for that Usurper;
 " and he absolutely refused to communi-
 " cate with them in *part*, since he could
 " not join in the whole; God giving him
 " the Grace to avoid the Snare into which
 " St. *Martin* had fallen before (*y*)."

Answ. It has already been answered by
 others, that *Maximus* had never been ac-
 knowledged by the Senate and People,
 nor thoroughly settled in his Government;
 but was on the contrary defeated by *Theo-*
dosius in the Course of his Enterprize:
 And that therefore his Case is not paral-
 lel to ours. Yet to gratify our Adversar-
 ies, I shall wave this Consideration; and
 without considering whether he were set-
 tled in his Dominions or no; I observe,
 that it is no where said, that St. *Ambrose*

refused Communion with him and his Bishops, because he could not join in the Prayers which they offered for him, but there are other Reasons assigned : *One*, because *Maximus* had murdered his innocent Master ; *another* seems to have been, because he had put Men to Death for Heresy : A *Third* certainly was, because he communicated with some Bishops, who had solicited him to put Hereticks to Death, and had been Excommunicated for that Barbarity.

Paulinus having mentioned with what Courage *Ambrose* discharged this Second Embassy from *Valentinian* to *Maximus*, adds ; " But he separated *Maximus* himself from Communion, admonishing him to repent of his having shed the Blood of his Lord, and (which was an Aggravation of his Crime) of his innocent Lord," viz. the Emperor *Gratian* (2). *Paulinus* here seems to say, that *Ambrose* formally excommunicated *Maximus*. And it is not in it self improbable that St. *Ambrose* should do so to an Enemy, and one who had killed his Master ;

(2) Ipsum vero Maximum à Communionis consortio segregavit, admonens, ut effusi sanguinis Domini sui, & quod gravius est, innocentis, ageret penitentiam.

since we know he excommunicated his own Emperor *Theodosius*, for having too severely punished a great Sedition in *Thessalonica*. But it is *improbable on this Account*, because St. *Ambrose* himself says nothing of it in his Letter to *Valentinian*, wherein he relates exactly and at length, what passed between him and *Maximus* in this second Embassy, and particularly informs us of his forbearing to communicate with *Maximus's* Bishops, because they were *Ithacians*: so that he could not well have forgot to have mentioned his having formally excommunicated *Maximus* himself, if he had done it. And therefore *Paulinus* seems to have mistaken *Ambrose's* Refusal to communicate with him for excommunicating him.

But our Adversaries can make no Advantage of this Passage, tho' we should grant, that *Paulinus* was not mistaken. For upon this supposed Excommunication of *Maximus*, *Ambrose* admonished him, to repent of his having murdered his innocent Master. Which shews, that if he excommunicated him, he did it, for having murdered *Gratian*. And so perhaps he would have excommunicated him, if he had murdered any other innocent Person.

Before I proceed to what St. *Ambrose* himself says of this Matter, I shall, for the

the better understanding thereof, premise, that the Primitive Christians had such an Abhorrence of being personally concerned in shedding Blood, that for that Reason, among others, it seems to have been a Doubt among some of them, whether a Christian could lawfully be a Civil Magistrate (a). St. Ambrose indeed was of Opinion, that a Christian Magistrate ought not to be excommunicated for sentencing Criminals to Death. Yet he observes, that most Christian Magistrates, who had passed Sentence of Death on Criminals, voluntarily abstained from Communion; and he commends them for it (b). But the Primitive Christians thought it an undoubted and flagrant Sin for a Magistrate to put Men to Death for Heresy; because that Punishment was esteemed improper, and too severe for that Crime (c). And

no

(a) Tertullian, to the Question, Whether a Christian could lawfully be a Civil Magistrate? answers, *Neque judicet de capite alicujus vel pudore, (seras enim de pecunia); neque damnet, neque prædamnet; neminem vinciat, neminem recludat aut torqueat: si hæc credibile est fieri posse. Tertull. de Idololat. c. 17.*

(b) Epist. 58. ad Studium. Edit. Basil. 1567. *Plerique etiam (qui in aliquos, capitalem sententiam ferendam existimaverunt) sponte se abstinere, & laudantur quidem, nec ipsi eos possumus non prædicare.*

(c) St. Martin told Maximus, *satis superque sufficere,*
ut

no Wonder then, that they judged it ha-
 noufly wicked for Bishops, (who ought
 rather to intercede for the Miserable) to
 procure the passing or executing a Sentence
 of Death upon any Criminals, much more
 upon Hereticks.

Now some Bishops had accused the
 Heretick *Priscillian* to *Maximus*, and so-
 licited him to condemn him, and put him
 to Death; which *Maximus* accordingly
 did. And these Bishops were called *Itha-*
cians, from one *Ithacius*, a Spanish Bishop,
 who was their Leader in these barbarous
 Proceedings. *Theognistus*, an Orthodox
 Bishop, excommunicated the *Ithacians* for
 their Cruelty. And *Ambrose*, in one of his
 Epistles (d), reflects severely upon Bi-
 shops, some of whom accused Criminals
 in the Courts of Justice, others urged the
 Magistrate to put them to Death, and o-
 thers approved of these Accusations and
 bloody Triumphs of Bishops. And it is
 agreed by the Learned, that *Ambrose* here
 meant the *Ithacians*. But *Maximus* made
 use of his imperial Force to preserve the
Ithacians from being censured; thinking

us Episcopali sententia Hæretici judicati Ecclesiis pel-
 lerentur. Sulp. Sev. Sac. H. L. 2. c. 65.

(d) Ep. 76. ad Studium.

no doubt, that if they were, he himself must come in for a principal Share of the Blame. And a Synod was held at *Treves*, which absolved *Ithacius*, and communicated with him. *St. Martin* coming to *Treves* soon after, refused at first to communicate with the *Ithacians*, but upon *Maximus's* promising to respite the Decree which he had made for executing some more of the *Priscillianists*; *St. Martin*, in order to save those Men from Death, altered his Behaviour, and communicated with the *Ithacians* that very Day on which one *Felix* was consecrated by them. But afterwards he repented of this Compliance, and would never again communicate with them (e). Soon after the Defeat of *Maximus*, *Ithacius* was, for having procured the Condemnation and Execution of *Priscillian*, not only excommunicated, but banished, and died in Banishment (f).

(e) Vid. Sulp. Sev. Sac. Hist. L. 2. c. 62, 63, 64, 65. De Virtutibus Martini, Dial. 3. c. 15.

(f) Prosper in Chronico, *Timasius* & *Promotus* Coll. *Ithacius* & *Ursacius* Episcopi ob necem *Priscilliani*, cujus Accusatores fuerant, Ecclesiæ communione privantur. Now *Timasius* and *Promotus* were Consuls in the Year 389. *Isidorus* Hisp. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, cap. 2. *Ithacius* cum *Ursacio* Episcopo, ob necem ejusdem *Priscilliani*, cujus Accusatores existerant, Ecclesiæ communione privatus, exilio condemnatur, ibique diem ultimam fungitur.

And

And it appears from the 5th Canon of the Council of *Turin*, held about the Year 397, that that Council, and the *French* Bishops, and *St. Ambrose*, and the then Bishop of *Rome*, refused to communicate with *Felix* (g). And *Baronius* concludes with great Probability, that the Reason why these Bishops did not communicate with *Felix*, was, because he communicated with the *Ithacians*, and was consecrated by them.

And now we may easily understand the Meaning of that Passage of *St. Ambrose*, to which *Dr. Hickes* alludes. The Words are these. “ When *Maximus* perceived, that
 “ I abstained from the Bishops who com-
 “ municated with him, or who solicited
 “ that some, who had indeed strayed
 “ from the Faith, should be put to Death,
 “ being offended therewith, he command-
 “ ed that I should retire immediately (h).

(g) Illud decrevit præterea sancta Synodus, ut (quoniam Legatos Episcopi Galliarum, qui Felici non communicant, destinarunt) si quis ab ejus Communionem se voluerit sequestrare, in nostræ sanctæ partis consortium suscipiatur, juxta literas venerabilis memoriæ Ambrosii Episcopi vel Romanæ Ecclesiæ sacerdotis dudum latus.

(h) Postea cum videbat me abstinere ab Episcopis qui communicabant ei, vel qui aliquos, devios licet a fide, ad necem periebant, commotus eis jussit me sine mora regredi.

By the Bishops who solicited that some who had strayed from the Faith should be put to Death, St. Ambrose plainly means the *Ithacians*: So that from hence thus much is manifest, that Ambrose abstained from the *Ithacians*, and thereby offended *Maximus*. And this is confirmed from St. Ambrose's next Words. "*Maximus* commanded that I should retire immediately: which I readily did, being only grieved, that I saw *Hyginus*, who was so old, that he was but just alive, carried into Banishment. And when I desired those who attended him, not to suffer the old Man to be thrust out without Clothes, or other Conveniences, I was thrust out my self (i)." Now *Hyginus* was Bishop of *Corduba*, and had at first been an Adversary of the *Priscillianists*, but afterward admitted them to Communion, and was therefore principally persecuted by the *Ithacians* (k).

As

(i) Ego vero libenter ingressus sum iter, hoc solo dolore percitus, quod *Hyginum* Episcopum senem in exilium duci competeri, cui nihil jam nisi extremus superesset spiritus. Cum de eo convehirem Comites ejus, ne sine veste, sine plumatio paterentur extrudi senem, extrusus ipse sum.

(k) Sulp. Sever. Sac. H. L. 2. c. 62. *Ithacio* negotium datum, ut maxime *Iginum* extra communionem faceret qui primus omnium infectari palam Hæreticos cepisset, postea turpiter depravatus in communionem eos recepisset.

As then *Ambrose's* Refusal to communicate with the *Ithacians*, provoked *Maximus* to command him to retire; so his interceding for *Hyginus*, who was persecuted by them, exasperated *Maximus* actually to force him away. The only Question then can be, What *St. Ambrose* means by abstaining from the Bishops who communicated with *Maximus*? Now from what has been said, it appears, that *Ambrose* thought it unlawful to communicate with *Maximus*, as *Paulinus* says, because he had murdered his innocent Master *Gratian*; and probably because he had put the *Priscillianists* to Death; and most certainly because he communicated with the *Ithacians*. But in all this Account, the Prayers for *Maximus* are never once mentioned, or so much as implied.

And whereas our Adversaries add, that *Ambrose* avoided the Snare into which *St. Martin* had fallen before, I readily grant it; and from thence I confirm, that *Ambrose* only avoided communicating with *Maximus's* Bishops, because they were *Ithacians*, or communicated with them. For the Snare into which *St. Martin* fell, was, his communicating with the *Ithacians*.

And in the beginning of the same Chapter *Hyginus* is called *Episcopus Cordubensis*.

Sul.

Salpicius Severus, who was *St. Martin's* Countryman and Acquaintance, and had this Account from his own Mouth (1), mentions no other Crime in the *Ithacians*, but their procuring the Condemnation and Execution of the *Priscillianists* (m), nor in the rest of *Maximus's* Bishops, but their communicating with the *Ithacians* (n). This appears to be the only Reason, for which *Maximus's* Bishops were afraid that *Martin* upon his coming to *Treves* would refuse to communicate with them (o). And when he did forbear their Communion, the only Complaint which they make against him to *Maximus* is, that he seconded with his Authority, the Ob-

(1) Veniam ad illud, quod propter notam temporum semper occultavit; sed nos celare non potuit. *And below*, Subinde nobis cum lacrymis (*Martinus*) ferebatur; se propter commutationis illius malum detrimentum sentire virtutis. *Sulp. Dial. 3. de virt. Martini, c. 15.*

(m) *Ibid.* *Maximus*, *Ithacium*; ceterosque illius socios vi Regia tuebatur, ne quis ei crimini daret; opera illius ejuscumquemodi hominem fuisse damnatum. *Et infra*; Imperator ex Episcoporum sententia decreverat Tribunos ad Hispanias mittere, qui Hæreticos inquirerent; deprehensis vitam & bona adimerent. Hæc nequaquam placitura Martino episcopi sentiebant.

(n) Quotidie communicantes *Ithacio* communem sibi causam fecerant. *Ibid.*

(o) Hæc nequaquam placitura Martino Episcopi sentiebat. Sed male conscis illa vel molestissima erat cura; ne se ab eorum communione adveniens abstinere. *Ibid.*

A TREATISE against the

Heresy of *Theognistus*, who had excommu-
 nicated the *Ithacians*; and that he was a
 Patron and Revenger of the *Priscillianists*
 (p). The only Arguments that *Maximus*
 used to convince *Martin* of the Lawfulness
 of communicating with his Bishops, was,
 that the *Priscillianists* were justly condemn-
 ed, and that there was no Reason to a-
 void the Communion of *Ithacius*, as the
 Synod had lately determined (q). And
 when afterward *Martin* repented of having
 complied with *Maximus*, it is only said,
 that from that Time he took care not to
 mingle in Communion with the *Ithacian* Par-
 ty (r). But *Sulpicius* no where mentions
 the least Title which implies, that *Mar-
 tin* found fault with the Prayers for *Maxi-
 mus*.

(p) Actum esse de suo omnium statu, si Theognisti
 pertinaciam, qui eos solus palam lata sententia condem-
 naverat, *Maximi* armaret Auctoritas: illum jam non de-
 fensorem Hæreticorum esse sed Vindicem: nihil actum
 more *Priscilliani*: si *Martinus* exerceat illius ultionem.

(q) Hæreticos sane damnatos more judiciorum publico-
 rum: potius quam infectionibus sacerdotum: non esse
 cautos: quæ *Ithacii* cæterorumque partis ejus communi-
 cationem potius esse damnandam. Quinetiam ante paucos
 dies hæc Synodus *Ithacium* pronuntiaverat culpa non
 teneri. *Ibid.*

(r) Inquit ab illo tempore satis cavet cum illa *Ithaci-
 ana* partis communione misceri. *Ibid.*

The

The Substance of the whole is this. If *Ambrose* excommunicated *Maximus*, as some collect from *Paulinus*, he excommunicated him for Murder. It is certain, that *Ambrose* abstained from *Maximus*, and his Bishops, because they were either excommunicated *Ithacians*, or communicated with such *Ithacians*. And consequently Dr. *Hickes* is manifestly mistaken in saying, "that *Ambrose* refused to communicate with them in part, because he could not join in the whole," i. e. that he would not communicate with them in any of their Prayers, because he could not join in Those for *Maximus*: Since even according to the Principles of our Adversaries, he ought not to have communicated with the *Ithacians*, tho' they had prayed for *Valentinian* and against *Maximus*. Lastly, Our Adversaries have no Colour to say, that *Ambrose* abstained from communicating with *Maximus* and his Bishops, on account of the Prayers for *Maximus*; but there is the strongest Proof which well can be of the contrary; and we may with more probability conclude, that both he and St. *Martin* approved of those Prayers; since there is not the least Appearance, that either of them made any Objection against them.

If our Adversaries had decried Arguments drawn from Example, or if Christians had not from the beginning pray'd for their Civil Governours, or if the Roman Emperors had inherited by a constant and uninterrupted Succession from Father to Son; it would have been excusable in our Adversaries, not to have produced Instances of the Behaviour of the Primitive Christians, in order to have justified their own. But they are continually boasting, that they imitate Primitive Practice: And there were frequent Revolutions among the Roman Emperors; And St. Paul commanded that Supplications should be made for Kings, and for all that are in Authority (f). And the Primitive Christians "prayed for all Emperors, that God would grant them long Life, Security to their publick Government, a sure House, valiant Armies, a faithful Senate, a Loyal People, quiet Times, and whatever they could desire for themselves, either in their publick or private Capacities." Which Prayers are much of the same Nature with our Government Prayers. Tertullian tells us this (i) in Honour of Christians, and he takes

(f) 1 Tim. 2. 1.

(i) Apologet. c. 30.

notice also (u); that they did not, like the Heathens, wish for *new* Emperors. And so, if when *new* Emperors succeeded with such Titles, which our Adversaries contend to be wrongful ones, the Christians had not submitted to them, nor prayed for them, but had been persecuted for refusing to do it; *Tertullian*, or some other Writer, would have undoubtedly recorded this also in their Recommendation, and preserved it among other Accounts of their Sufferings. If then the *Primitive Church* had been of the same Opinion with our Adversaries, one might reasonably have expected that they would have urged many Examples in their Defence. But they have only offered to produce this one of *St. Ambrose*, which, as I have shewn, does not in the least make for them, but rather *against* them.

Mr. *Earbery* replies, "The Revolutions of the *Roman* Empire were very rapid and sudden, an Usurper was either dead, or the only Regnant Prince in a short Period of Time (w).

Answ. This is a fair Confession, that our Adversaries cannot produce Examples.

(u) *Ibid.* c. 35.

(w) *Admonition to Dr. Kenner*, p. 92.

But the Disputes for the *Roman* Empire often lasted such a considerable Time, that the Clergy must have been obliged to have prayed for the Invader, in those Provinces of the Empire which were possessed by him, before he was the only Regnant; or else they must have suffered for refusing to do it. For Instance, this very *Maximus* was for several Years contending for the Empire, and in Possession of the Provinces of *Britain, Gaul, and Spain*. And therefore I conclude, that as at present conquered Towns do immediately, and during the War, acknowledge the Conqueror; so when an Invader became possessed of a *Roman* Province, the *Primitive Christians* thought themselves at Liberty to submit to and pray for him; since we hear nothing of their Refusal to do so.

And farther, several of those Usurpers, when they came to be the only Regnants, had at best no other Title than forced Submission or Conquest, which, as Dr. *Hicks* says (x), *gives no Right*. And consequently to pray for such Regnant Princes, must be, according to him, *to put up to the just and holy God, Prayers contrary to his essential Truth and Righteousness*.

Mr. Earbery farther urges, "As for the Prayers, they proceeded in the usual Form, without mentioning any Name (y).

Ans. 1. Dr. Hickee contradicts Mr. Earbery, and implies that they did pray for their Emperors by Name, particularly for *Maximus*; and that therefore *Ambrose* refused to communicate with *Maximus's* Bishops. Now I desire our Adversaries to tell me, which of these two Advocates of theirs they will adhere to.

2. Mr. Earbery brings no Proof of what he says, and there is very good Proof of the contrary. *St. Ambrose*, Bishop of *Milan*, flourish'd in the Year 374. And there is an Office which goes under his Name, and is ascribed to him by *Walafridus Strabo* (z), who lived 900 Years ago, and it had certainly in the Time of *Walafridus* been long used in the Church of *Milan*, and in that Office they prayed for their Princes by Name (a).

(y) *Ibid.* (z) *De Rebus Eccles. Cap. 22.*

(a) Pro Famulo tuo N. Imperatore, & Famula tua N. Imperatrice — Pro Famulo tuo N. Rege & Duce nostro. *Ambrosii Missa edita à Pamelio, Colon. 1571. p. 331.* Hæc dona tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta Catholica, quam pacificare & custodire digneris unguam Famulo tuo N. Imperatore. *Ibid. p. 301.*

And what follows, confirms the Authority of that Office in this Point. Gregory the Great flourished in 590, and wrote a Communion Office for the whole Year; of which there are several very ancient Manuscripts; particularly one called the Manuscript of St. Eligius, which is judged by the Learned to be about 1000 Years old (b). And in that Manuscript, not to mention other Copies, there is a Petition for the King by Name, as well as for the Pope; And this Petition is expressed in almost the very same Words as one of those in St. Ambrose's Office (c); which makes it probable, that Gregory transcribed it out of Ambrose.

St. Athanasius had been accused to Constantius, that he had not prayed for him, when his Rival Magnentius the Usurper set up against him. This would have been a senseless Accusation, if Christians had in those Times prayed for their Civil Governours, without mentioning their Names. For then it would have been no Crime to have omitted Constantius's Name;

(b) *Vid. Menardi Praefat. ad Gregorii Librum-Sacramentorum.*

(c) *Ibid. p. 2. Hæc dona tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta Catholica, quam pacificare, custodire, adunare & regere digneris toto orbe terrarum, cum famulo tuo Papa nostro III. & Rege nostro III.*

and.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 427

and it could not have appeared, whether *Athanasius* prayed for *Constantius* or *Magnentius*, since both pretended to be Emperors. *Athanasius* tells *Constantius*, in his *Apology* to him, the very Words of his *Exhortation* to the People to pray for him by Name, and of the *Response* which the People made. I only said, "Let us pray for the Safety of the most pious Emperor CONSTANTIUS. And all the People immediately cried out with a loud Voice, "O Christ help CONSTANTIUS. And they continued to pray so (d).

This was in the middle of the Fourth Century. *St. Chrysostom* flourish'd soon after. And his Liturgy has been generally used throughout the Greek Church: and in that the Greeks prayed for their Princes by Name. *Leo Thufcus* is agreed to have translated that Liturgy into Latin, as early as the Year 1180: And in his Translation, after the Consecration of the Elements, the Priest prays in general for the Clergy, the World, the Church, and the Emperors, without mentioning their Names. Then the Deacon pronounces

(d) *Athanas.* Tom. 1. p. 679. Μόνον ὃ ἔλεγον, Εὐχόμεθα
 ὡς τὸ συνήκει· Ἐὐχόμεθα τοῦ Αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες ὁ λαὸς
 εὐχόμεθα μὴ φανῇ ἐν ἡμῖν. καὶ βοήθει καὶ πάντας· καὶ διέδομεν ἅπαντες
 εὐχόμεθα.

the following Petitions. " Long be the
 " Days of the most Holy and OEcume-
 " nical Pope *Nicolas*. Long be the Days
 " of *Eleutherius* of *Alexandria*, of *Cyri*l of
 " *Antioch*, of *Leontius* of *Jerusalem*. (We
 " also pray) for the Priest who offers these
 " Gifts to the Lord God, for the véné-
 " rable Presbyters, for the Deacons in Christ
 " (e), and all the Sacerdotal Order; and
 " for the victorious and long Reign of
 " our most pious and Christian Empe-
 " rors, the Emperor *Alexius* the Great,
 " and *Porphyrogenitus* (f), and for the
 " Peace and good Estate of the whole
 " World (g).

(e) So I have taken the Liberty to translate *Venerabili Presbyterio ejus quæ in Christo est Ministratio*. For it will shortly appear from the French King's MS. that the Words in the Greek were, Ἐννοῦν ἀποστολῆς, ἡ ἐν ἁγίᾳ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ.

(f) The Greeks used to call those Sons, who were born while their Fathers were Emperors, μαγευγενῆς.

(g) *Nicola* Sanctissimi & Universalis Papæ longa sint tempora. *Eleutherii Alexandria*, *Cyrtilli Antiochie*, *Leontii Hierosolymorum* longa sint tempora. Et pro offerente Sancta monera hæc Domino Deo Sacerdote, venerabili Presbyterio ejus quæ in Christo est Ministratio, & omni sacerdotali ordine. Et pro Imperio in Victoria & Perseverancia Puissimorum & in Christo dilectorum Imperatorum nostrorum N. & N. *Alexii Magni Imperatoris* & *Porphyrogeniti*. Et pro pace & bono statu totius mundi. Vid. *Liturgias S. Patrum*. Paris 1560.

From

From hence it appears that *Leo* translated this much earlier than is commonly thought, or at least, that he translated it out of a Copy, which then was about 100 Years old. For this Pope *Nicolas* was not one of the Popes of *Rome*: because no *Nicolas* was Pope of *Rome* during the Reigns of the *Alexis*: And at that time the *Greek Church* did not mention the Bishop of *Rome* in her publick Offices. But this *Nicolas* must be a Bishop of *Constantinople*. For it would be absurd to suppose, that in this Liturgy they should pray for the three inferior Patriarchs, viz. Those of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*: and take no notice of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who was by far the chief Patriarch of *Greece*. And the Patriarchs of *Greece* were very anciently called Popes: and the Patriarch of *Constantinople* had long had the Title of OEcumenical. This *Nicolas* then was he whom *Alexius Comenus* made Bishop of *Constantinople* about the Year 1084. (b). And there is extant an Epistle of this *Nicolas* under the following Title; *A Synodical Epistle of the most Holy and OEcumenical*

(b) Vid. Joan. Zonaræ *Annales*. Tom. 3. in *Alexio Commeno*, p. 236. Edit. Basl. 1557.

430 A TREATISE against the

menical Patriarch Nicolas to Alexius Comnenus (i). Indeed there was a later Nicolas Patriarch of Constantinople: but that was not in or near the Reign of an Alexius, but in the Reign of Emmanuel Comnenus (k). Alexius, not long after he had made Nicolas Patriarch, had a Son born whom he named John, and immediately put a Diadem upon his Head (l). And this John is undoubtedly the Person whom the Liturgy means by *Porphyrogenitus*, having generally had that Title given him (m). So that the Manuscript from which Leo made this Translation must be in all probability above 600 Years old.

Another Copy of Chrysostom's Liturgy written, as Goar judges (n), about the Year 1260 mentions the *Palaeologi*. In another Copy belonging to the French King, and written as Goar judges (o), about 300 Years ago, after the Elements

(i) *Juris Græco-Romani*, p. 271. Edit. Francof. 1598. Confer. p. 269.

(k) *Ibid.* p. 302.

(l) *Ibid.* Zonar. p. 237.

(m) *Ibid.* p. 244, & *Juris Græc. Rom.* p. 302. Nicolas's Successor is said to have been Patriarch of Constantinople, *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀλεξίῳ κομνηνῷ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ πορφυρογενίτῃ*.

(n) In *Prefat. ad Euchologion Græcorum*.

(o) *Eucholog.* p. 95.

are

are consecrated, the Deacon prays by Name for the most Holy and OEcumenical Patriarch Joseph, for Philotheus of Alexandria, Mark of Antioch, Theophilus of Jerusalem, and other Ecclesiastical Superiors, and lastly for the most Religious and Christian Emperor and Empress John and Mary, &c. (p.)

And this was not peculiar to the Church Subject to the *Grecian* Emperors. For in a Copy written, as *Goar* judges, about the Year 1260, there is a Petition for *Roger* King of *Sicily* (q). Now he was King of that Country about the Year 1130, or earlier: and therefore that Copy is probably more ancient than *Goar* imagined, or is at least a Transcript of a Copy written about 600 Years ago. And Lastly, in the *Aethiopic* Liturgy they prayed for their Princes by Name (r).

[illegible]

(q) *Vid. Præfat. ad Eucholog.*

(r) *Cum incensat Altare dicit Orationem. Memento Domine Regis Nostri N. & omnium Regum Christianorum, &c. p. 70. Tom. 6. Bib. Patr. Paris, 1589. confer. p. 47.*

It

It may perhaps be objected, that Princes are not mentioned by Name in the first Copy of *Chrysostom's* Liturgy printed by *Goar*. But *Goar* owns (*s*) that Copy to be a Modern one, and says he chose it, because it was most agreeable to that which is now generally used by the *Greeks* (*t*). And he informs us (*u*), that when the *Greek* Christians pray, as they do now, for their Princes without naming them; they do not mean, the *Turkish* Emperors, but our Christian Princes, whom they look upon to have the best right to be their Governours. It is no wonder then, that they should not mention their Princes by Name. And *Goar* informs us also that they have razed even several of the Petitions themselves for Princes out of several Manuscripts. For these Reasons we are not to expect, that Civil Governours should be mentioned by Name in any Copies written by the *Greeks* since the taking of *Constantinople*, nor in those ancient Copies which appear to have been altered by them. Lastly, the Books of Common Prayer, which were actually used in the

(*s*) *Eucholog.* p. 108.

(*t*) *Ibid.* p. 37. (*u*) *Ibid.* p. 46.

Greek Church, must be different according to the different Princes, Bishops, Abbots and Abbesses, whom they prayed for in particular Churches. Now the Copies which I have quoted, are not only ancient ones, but appear to be the very Forms which were actually used in several Churches. For Instance; one of them was undoubtedly used in the Church of *Sicily*; *Leo Thuscus's* was probably used in some Patriarchal Church of *Greece*, because no inferior Bishop is pray'd for, but only the *Greek Patriarchis*; and the *French King's* was used in a Religious House, where *Hypomone* and *Eugenia* presided. But several Manuscripts of this Liturgy appear to have been written for general Use, and do not mention particular Names, but leave those Things which vary according to the Difference of Times and Places to be supplied as there is occasion. Of this Nature were the Diptychs, which contained the Names of those living Persons for whom they prayed in the Church by Name, and which consequently must be different in different Churches. And this seems to be the Reason that some Copies of *St. Chrysostom's* Liturgy, and also of *St. Basil's*, do not give us a particular Account of the Diptychs, but only say of them in general, that after the Consecration

on the Deacon perfumes with Incense the Holy Table and the Diptychs, and remembers whom he pleases, both of the Dead and Living (w); i. e. as to the Living, he pronounced their Names out of the Diptychs, and prayed for them. For Gouar (x) and Cardinal Bona (y), who were both Men of great Learning, especially in the ancient Liturgies, refer us for the Form of these Diptychs, to that Passage which I have already quoted out of the French King's Manuscript. And in that there are Petitions for their Civil, as well as their Ecclesiastical Governours by Name. And Leo Thuscus's Copy is almost Word for Word the same with the French King's.

In short then, it is clear, that the Western Church did in their Liturgies pray for their Princes by Name. And that is sufficient for my Purpose. For if the Primitive Christians had thought and acted like our Adversaries, we should have had Instances enough of it from the Western Church alone.

But the Western Church was not singular in this respect. For the Church of Athio-

(w) *Ibid.* p. 78, 170. Chrysost. Op. Tom. 6, p. 998.

(x) *Eucholog.* p. 144.

(y) *De Rebus Liturgicis*, L. 2. c. 12.

pia also prayed for their Princes by Name. And *Athanasius* was accused of not praying for *Constantius*, when *Magnentius* set up against him; which manifestly implies, that they then mentioned Princes by Name in their Publick Prayers. And *Athanasius* asserts this to have been a Calumny, and that both he and his People did mention *Constantius* by Name in their Liturgy; and that they continued so to do. And the *Greek Church* in general prayed for their Civil Governours by Name, as appears from several ancient Copies of *St. Chrysostom's* Liturgy. And as to those Copies in which Princes are not mentioned by Name, the principal Reason seems to be, that they do not give a particular Account of that Part of the Service where it was usual to pray for Living Persons by Name, viz. the Diptychs, but only take notice in general, that in such a Place the Deacon uses the Diptychs.

Thus I have answered all the Objections I could meet with against Communicating with us now, even supposing us to have been before in the Wrong. But I cannot dismiss the two last of these Objections, viz. That our Adversaries cannot join in the Prayers for our Civil Governours, and that we are guilty of Heresy in maintaining the Lawfulness of Resisting Kings, without ob-

observing, that it was not upon these Accounts that our Adversaries at first divided from us: but these are late Inventions to defend their Nonconformity, when they were resolv'd to continue it, after the Grounds on which they began it were extinguish'd. Dr. *Hickes* informs us (z), that *they date the Schism from the Consecrations of the Usurping Bishops*, as he mis-calls them: which manifestly shews, that they pretended to divide only on account of those Consecrations; and it is also a Confession, that they communicated with us till that Time, *i. e.* till *May 31, 1691*, on which Day the first Bishop, *viz.* Archbishop *Tillotson*, was consecrated. Now this was above Two Years and a Quarter after King *William* and Queen *Mary* were proclaim'd. During which Time we had the like Prayers for the Government, and as much taught the Lawfulness of Resisting Kings, as we have done since; and yet our Adversaries did not then think they had reason to divide from us.

And therefore it was with great Justice, that Mr. *Dodwel*, who had before been the chief Advocate of the *Nonconforming Non-jurors*, and had been highly commended by them for his Writings in their Defence

(z) Pag. 39.

(a), ex-

(a), expostulated with his old Friends, that they should continue the Breach, after the Deprived Bishops were dead, and the Pretence was taken away, on which they at first divided. "Who would have thought, *says he* (b), that Sons of Peace, and Candidates for the Beatitude which is promised to Peace-makers, should shew themselves so averse to Peace, as not readily to lay hold on the first Occasion the God of Peace has been pleased to present them of returning to Peace? Who could have believed, that so many strenuous Assertors of the Rights of Episcopacy, should now shew so little Regard to the whole Episcopal College, as to mention a state of Segregation with any Complacency, and a Continuance in that State without any likelihood, by their *new* Principles, of ever reuniting again on our *old Catholick* Principles? Who could have even suspected, that they could have found in their Hearts to keep long out of the Communion of their Mother and Brethren, without any Hopes of Reconciliation? Yet to our no less Sorrow, than Surprizal, we find these Things too true, which if they had not actually come to pass, we could

(a) Vid. *Dr. Hickes*, p. 22.

(b) *Case in Fact*, p. 2.

“ hardly have feared or believed. They
 “ are so far from laying hold on the easy
 “ Terms which Providence has offered to
 “ them, and making that good Use of
 “ this Providence, which God intended
 “ that they should do, and which in Grati-
 “ tude might have been expected from so
 “ endearing a Providence; that on the
 “ contrary, they are striving their excel-
 “ lent Wits to find new Pretences every
 “ Day, for continuing the new Schism,
 “ as conscious, that the only justifiable
 “ Reason has indeed failed them, and yet
 “ unwilling to reunite with their old
 “ Friends and Fellow-Communicants.

I have now gone through the Four Ge-
 neral Propositions I had laid down; and
 since our Adversaries are not willing to al-
 low any Deprivation but Ecclesiastical to
 be valid, I have proved that the Nonjuring
 Bishops were deprived by the Ecclesiasti-
 cal, as well as by the Lay Power: And for
 fear they should still contend, that they
 were deprived only by the Lay Power, I
 have shewn, that the Supreme Lay-Power
 may Rightfully deprive. Nay, that *I might*
by any means gain some of our Adversaries, I
 have comply'd with them so far as to sup-
 pose for Argument sake those Things to
 be true, which are most certainly false,
viz. that the Nonjuring Bishops were de-
 prived

prived by Lay-Powers only Supreme *de facto*, and that our Adversaries had reason to separate from us, during the Lives of the Deprived Bishops. And having thus come down to their own Terms, I have evinced, that upon the former Supposition, they could *never* justify their Separation; and that upon the latter they have no Pre-
tence nor Colour for it *now*. And I am fully persuaded that I have made out every one of these Points: But I desire our Adversaries to consider, that unless I have fail'd in every one, they must according to their own Principles, own, that we are not, but that they themselves are, guilty of the great and dangerous Sin of Schism.

And to these Arguments I shall add one more, to clear us of the Guilt of being Schismatics, *viz.* that supposing our Bishops to have been in the wrong, as to the Breach which happened between them and the Deprived Bishops, it would not from thence have followed, that they were Schismatics. Whatever Difference falls out between Bishops, one side or other must be mistaken: but the mistaken Party does not immediately commence a Schismatick. Because, he is a Schismatick who knowingly, and wilfully, and obstinately divides from, and disowns rightful Spiritual Authority, or who communicates

with those whom he knows to be guilty of such Division. And therefore those who divide in doubtful Cases, and which have not been Synodically divided, have often not been esteemed Schismatics; because their Division, tho' perhaps in some measure faulty, does not appear to be perverse and obstinate. And much more where those who have been Principals and most faulty, have been esteemed Schismatics by some: yet till they have not been Synodically condemned, those who communicated with them, have been esteemed Schismatics, even by those who disowned such Principals; tho' the Controversy has sometimes been depending for many Years.

St. John observed the Feast of *Easter* at the same Time as the *Jews* did their *Pasover*: and the *Asian Churches* followed his Example for the first Ages of Christianity. The *Western Church* kept their *Easter* at the same Time that we do ours now. And because the *Asian Churches* would not conform to the *Western* in this Point, *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* quarreled with them to a very high degree. His Cause being unjust, it was not in his Power to cut them off from the *Catholick Church*. But he endeavoured it (c), and did what he could

(c) Ἐπὶ ταῖς τοῖς ὁμοῖς ὁμοῖς ὁμοῖς Βικτωρ ἀγῶνι τῇ Ἀσίᾳ
πᾶσι ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὁμοῖς ὁμοῖς τῇ παλαιᾷ ἀποστολῇ,
ὡς ἐπεδίδευσεν, τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Euseb. H. E. L. 5.
c. 24. towards

towards it. He declared them Excommunicated, and actually shut them out from communicating with his own Church.

This is what some Papists deny, being unwilling to own, that a Bishop of Rome could be guilty of so wicked an Action. But *Eusebius* says (d), that *Victor* did by his Letters proscribe all the *Asians*, and declare them utterly excommunicated. And *Socrates* (e) positively affirms, that *Victor* sent an Excommunication to the *Asians*. And *Epiphanius* adds (f), that he would not receive their Communicatory Letters; which is a strong Confirmation, that he Excommunicated them.

Eusebius indeed says, that *Irenaeus* writing to *Victor* upon this Subject, exhorted him not to cut off whole Churches of God (g).

(d) Καὶ σκληραίηαι Ἀγ' γραμματίηαι, ἀναγιγνάντες ἄρδην πάντες τὲς ἐκείσε ἀνακηρύττειν ἀδελφῶς. Ibid. Which *Valesius* himself, tho' one of those who deny that *Victor* excommunicated the *Asians*, thus translates. "Datisque Literis universos qui illic erant Fratres proscribit, & ab unitate Ecclesiae prorsus alienos esse pronuntiat."

(e) H. E. L. 5. c. 12. Ὁ δὲ Ρώμη ἐπίσκοπος Βίκτωρ ἡμῶντα ἡρησινθεῖς ἀναγιγνάντων τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ποταρισκαδικαίτοις ἀπίστειν. Confer. Niceph. Callist. L. 4. c. 38.

(f) Hæres. 70. Ἐπὶ χρόνις Πολυκάρπῳ (l. Πολυκρότης) καὶ Βίκτωρ ὡς ἡ ἀναβλή ὡς τὴν δύσιν Ἀφροδιμένη εἰρηνικὰ παρ' ἀλλήλων ἐσμ' ἐδύχοντο.

(g) Ὅς μὴ δαπάνησι ἑλκεῖ ἐκκλησίας Θεῷ παρατιθεῖ. Euseb. ubi supra.

From

From whence some collect, that *Victor* never excommunicated the *Asians*. But *Eusebius's* Words may only mean, that *Irenæus* exhorted *Victor* not to continue the *Asians* under the Sentence of Excommunication. And besides, *Eusebius* does not ascertain the Time when *Irenæus* wrote this Letter; so that supposing *Victor* not to have then excommunicated the *Asians*; yet it does not follow, that he hearkened to *Irenæus*, and did not excommunicate them afterward. And it is strange, that Men should conclude that *Victor* did not do this, barely because *Eusebius* tells us that *Irenæus* wrote to dissuade him; when we have the express Testimonies of *Eusebius* himself, as well as several others, to the contrary.

Another Objection is, that *Eusebius* calls *Irenæus* a Peace-Maker. But this is, if possible, weaker than the former Objection. For *Eusebius* manifestly calls *Irenæus* a Peace-Maker, on account of his Temper, and of his Exhortations and Embassies for the Peace of the Church (b), not of the Suc-

(b) Εἰρηναῖος φερώνυμος περὶ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ, αὐτὸς π τῷ
 τῶν πρῶτων εἰρηνοποιός, τοιαύτως ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνης παρα-
 κάλει π καὶ ἐπέσκειν. *Ibid.*

cess of them, which he does not so much as once mention.

By this unjustifiable Proceeding, *Victor* displeased not only the Persons injured, but several other Bishops, who expostulated with him very roundly upon this Occasion. But it does not appear, that they broke off Communion with him. The Ecclesiastical Historians make no mention of any such Matter: nor does *Irenæus* write to him, as to a Bishop from whom he had separated. The Catholics did not constitute any other Person Bishop of *Rome* in his stead, nor is there any Sign that they attempted or intended to do it, as undoubtedly they would have done, if they had judged him a Schismatick. On the contrary, he died in the Communion of the Catholic Church, and the undisputed Possession of his See, with the Reputation of a Saint and Martyr (i). And on the other Hand there is not the least Appearance or Probability, that *Victor* broke off Communion with *Irenæus*, tho' *Irenæus* undoubtedly continued to communicate with the *Asians*, who were excommunicated by *Victor*.

(i) Vid. *Pontificale Romanum in Victore*. His Saint's Day is July 28. Vid. *Baronii Martyrolog. Roman.*

St. Cyprian judged Baptism administred by Hereticks to be Invalid and Null: For which Mistake that renowned Saint was Excommunicated by Stephen Bishop of Rome. This also is what the Papists are ashamed to own: and it was probably to conceal this, as well as some other Matters, that they had the Confidence in some of their Editions of Cyprian, knowingly and designedly to omit Firmilian's Letter to him, which plainly proves this Point (k).

For Firmilian observes to Cyprian (l),
 " There had before been several Differences between particular Churches,
 " but yet they did not depart from the
 " Peace and Unity of the Catholick Church,
 " as Stephen has dared to do by breaking
 " Peace with you, which his Predecessors always preserved." From whence Rigaltius (m) justly concludes against Baronius, that Stephen broke off Communion with Cyprian. Firmilian says the same

(k) Vid. Annotat. in initium Epistole Firmiliani. Edit. Oxon. p. 217.

(l) Ibid. p. 220. In plurimis Provinciis multa pro locorum & nominum diversitate variantur; ne tamen propter hoc ab Ecclesia Catholica pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est. Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversum vos pacem quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore & honore mutuo custodierunt,

(m) In locum.

thing still more plainly in another Passage of the same Letter (n). "How great
 " a Sin, says he to Stephen, have you com-
 " mitted by having cut your self off from
 " so many Flocks, viz. the Churches of
 " the whole World? For you have cut
 " your self off; do not deceive your self:
 " Since he is truly a Schismatick, who has
 " made himself an Apostate from the Com-
 " munion of Ecclesiastical Unity. While
 " therefore you think that all Persons
 " may be excommunicated by you, you
 " have only excommunicated your self from
 " all." Here *Firmilian* directly affirms,
 more than once, that *Stephen* had excom-
 municated himself from the Catholick
 Church, i. e. he had done so in the Judg-
 ment of *Firmilian*. And it is manifest,
 that he draws this Inference from *Stephen's*
 having excommunicated *Cyprian*.

And farther, whereas it was the con-
 stant Custom, not only to admit to Eccle-
 siastical Communion, but to entertain in

(u) *Ibid.* p. 228. Lites enim & dissensiones quantas
 parasti per Ecclesias totius mundi? Peccatum vero quam
 magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te à tot gregibus sci-
 disti? Excidisti enim reipsum: noli te fallere: Siquidem
 illè est vere schismaticus, qui se à communione Eccle-
 siasticæ unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas om-
 nes à te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.

their

their Houses, Christians recommended by one Church to another : And on the contrary Christians were, according to St. John's Direction (o), prohibited to receive Excommunicated Persons into their Houses, or bid them God speed; Firmilian does in this Letter also acquaint us (p), " That when Cyprian sent Legates to Rome, Stephen would not admit them to Communion, nay, he would not so much as speak with them, or have any common Conversation with them. And he did not barely forbear to communicate with them himself, but he commanded all the Brotherhood (of Rome), not to receive them into their Houses," And a little after Firmilian says, " That Stephen was not ashamed to divide the Brotherhood (q)." So that Stephen plainly excommunicated the Africans in the most formal and solemn Manner.

(o) 2 John 10.

(p) *Ubi supra.* A Vobis Legatos Episcopos patienter satis & leniter suscepit, ut eos nec ad sermonem saltem colloqui communis admitteret: adhuc insuper dilectionis & caritatis memor, præciperet fraternitati universæ, nequis eos in domum suam reciperet; ut venientibus non solum pax & communio, sed & rectum & hospitium negaretur. Hoc est servasse unitatem Spiritus in conjunctione pacis, abscindere se à caritatis unitate, & alienum se per omnia fratribus facere, & contra sacramentum & fidem contumacis furore discordiæ rebellare.

(q) Et tamen non pudet Stephanum ——— Fraternitatem scindere.

But

But tho' *Stephen* did thus unjustly excommunicate them, yet it does not appear that the rest of the Bishops who were not immediately concerned in this Dispute, abstained from communicating with either Party. On the contrary *Stephen* was put to Death soon after for the Profession of Christianity, and has always been esteemed a Saint and a Martyr (r); which he could not have been, if he had not died in the Communion of the Church. And the same is also evident of *Cyprian*.

And which is full to my Point, when Altar has been set up against Altar, the Primitive Christians did not always excommunicate nor declare Schismatics, even those whom they believed to be wrongful Anti-Bishops; and much less did they esteem those Bishops to be Schismatics, who communicated with such Anti-Bishops, before they were Synodically condemned. A clear and remarkable Proof whereof is, the Case of the See of *Antioch*, which I have before had occasion to mention (s).

(r) Vid. *Pontificale Romanum* in *Stephano*, & *Acta Martyrii Stephani* apud *Baronium* in *Anno* 260. 4, & *Baronii Martyrolog.* 2 Augusti.

(s) *Supra*, p. 243---245.

About the Year 362, in the beginning of the Reign of *Julian* (t), *Paulinus* was consecrated Bishop of *Antioch* in opposition to *Meletius* Bishop of that City, who was then living and claiming. *Meletius* died in 381, and *Flavian* was consecrated his Successor, in opposition to *Paulinus*. And when *Paulinus* died, *Evagrius* succeeded him in opposition to *Flavian*. The Bishop of *Rome* and the *Westerns*, and most probably *Athanasius* and the *Egyptians* (w), did from the very first acknowledge *Paulinus*. And the *Egyptians* as well as the *Westerns* did certainly acknowledge *Evagrius* (x). But the Generality of the

(t) Socrat. H. E. L. 3. c. 5, 6.

(u) Vid. Theodoriti, H. E. L. 5. c. 11. *Epist. Secundam Aquileiensis concilii ad Theodos. à Sirmondo editam*: Basilii, *Epist.* 349. Terentio inscriptam, p. 1128. Edit. Paris 1618. confer *Ep.* 52 & 74. *ibid.* p. 826, 876.

(w) *Paulinus* sent two Deacons to the Council of *Alexandria*, which was composed of Bishops out of *Italy*, *Arabia*, *Egypt* and *Lybia*, and *Athanasius* presided, and *Eusebius Vercellensis* was present. And *Paulinus* was the first in order of the absent Bishops who subscribed the Synodical Epistle of that Council. Vid. *Athanas. Tom. 1. p. 574, 580.* From whence it is highly probable, that *Athanasius*, *Eusebius*, and that Council acknowledged *Paulinus*. And *Basil* also seems to imply in the abovementioned 349th Epistle, that *Athanasius* acknowledged *Paulinus*. For he says, *that it was no Wonder, that the Westerns should either not know the Truth, or should conceal the Cause which induced Athanasius to write to Paulinus.*

(x) Theod. H. E. L. 5. c. 23.

Easterns continued to own *Meletius* (y); as is confessed by *Baronius* (z), tho' a great Advocate of *Paulinus*, because *Paulinus* was acknowledg'd by the Bishop of Rome. And *Flavian* was also acknowledged by the *Easterns* in the OEcumenical Council of *Constantinople* (a), and particularly by the *Syrians*, *Phenicians*, *Palestines*, and most of the *Armenians*, *Cappadocians*, *Galatians*, and those of *Pontus* (b). Some Time after the Death of *Evagrius*, the *Westerns* and *Egyptians* were persuaded to acknowledge *Flavian*, and so the Breach was made up (c).

Now, tho' the *Westerns* and *Egyptians* did thus acknowledge one of the *Antiochian* Rivals, and the Generality of the *Easterns* the other: yet they did not break off Communion with one another during all this Controversy, which lasted about 40 Years (d). Nay, they did not Excommunicate

(y) Vid. *Epist. Basilii* 349 & alias. *Socrat. L. 3. c. 25.* *Sozom. L. 6. c. 4.*

(z) *Anno* 362. 217 & alibi.

(a) *Theodorit. H. E. L. 5. c. 9.*

(b) *Sozom. L. 7. c. 11.* *Socrat. L. 5. c. 10.*

(c) *Sozom. L. 8. c. 3.*

(d) *Socrates* says (*H. E. L. 5. c. 15.*) that after *Evagrius's* Death, *Theophilus* reconciled *Flavian* to *Damasus*. Now *Damasus* died about the Year 384. (*Socrat.*

communicate nor declare Schismaticks, those very Principals in the Quarrel, whom they esteemed to be wrongful Bishops.

It

H. E. L. 7. c. 9.) So that according to *Socrates*, this Dispute was ended in about 22 Years. But he certainly by mistake named *Damasus* instead of some other Bishop of Rome. For *St. Jerom* (*Tom. i. p. 302.*) seems plainly to speak of *Evagrius*, as if even he was living when he wrote his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. "*Evagrius Antiochia Episcopus diversarum hypotheson tractatus mihi legit, quos necdum edidit.*" And in his Prefatory Epistle to that Catalogue, he declares that he gives an Account of Writers to the 14th Year of *Theodosius* (*Ibid. p. 261.*) i. e. to the Year 392, when *Damasus* had been dead many Years. And *Sozomen*, (*l. 8. c. 3.*) says, that this Reconciliation was made after *Chrysostom* was constituted Bishop of *Constantinople*. Now he was advanced to that See in the Year 398. *Palladius* says, that *Flavian* and *Theophilus* communicated together, after they had broken off Communion with one another for 20 Years. (*Pallad. p. 51.*) And *Theodoret* (*H. E. L. 5. c. 23.*) says, that this Breach was not healed till *Innocent* was Bishop of Rome. Now he was advanced to that See in the Beginning of the Year 402. And if from the Year 381, when *Flavian* was consecrated, we reckon 20 Years; we shall find that *Palladius's* Account does nearly agree with *Theodoret's*. And herein *Palladius* and *Theodoret* do not contradict *Sozomen*. For *Sozomen* does not say, as some have mistaken him, that *Chrysostom*, soon after he was made Bishop, actually reconciled the Bishop of Rome to *Flavian*, but only that he immediately set about it. (*Αδρίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν παρελθὼν, ἐδίδου Θεοφίλῳ συμπράξαι αὐτῷ, καὶ καλεῖσθαι φιλανθρωπῶς τὸν Πατριάρχην ἐπίσκοπον*). And the finishing such a Matter must, in its own Nature, and even according to the Account *Sozomen* gives of it, have been a Work of Time. Indeed *Theodoret* writes in the same Place, that this Difference was ended, when it was of seventeen Years standing; which

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 451

It is certain, that while *Meletius* lived, which was near 20 Years of the 40, those who rejected him, did not excommunicate nor declare him a Schismatick: Much less did they break off Communion with those who acknowledged him: but both Parties maintained Peace with one another (e).

Our Adversaries will perhaps say, that the Reason of this was, because it had been Synodically agreed, that *Meletius* and *Paulinus* should respectively govern the Flocks which adhered to them, and that the Survivor should govern the whole. But according to all the Ecclesiastical Historians, this Composition was not made till after *Walens's* Death; and he died in the Year 378. And long before that

which Years some reckon from 381, when *Flavian* was consecrated, and from thence infer, that this Reconciliation was made in 398, when *Siricius* was Bishop of Rome, and that *Theodoret* is inconsistent with himself, when he represents it to have been made in *Innocent's* Time. But probably *Theodoret* reckoned those seventeen Years from the Consecration of *Theophilus*, to the See of *Alexandria*: which was in the Year 385, (*Socrat. L. 5. c. 12.*) And then the Account falls in exactly with the Year 402, when *Innocent* was consecrated. According then to *Palladius* and *Theodoret*, this Affair was not ended till about the Year 402. Now, from 362, when *Paulinus* was consecrated, to 402, are Forty Years. But thus much seems indisputable, that this Difference was not made up till 398: So that it lasted at least Thirty six Years.

(e) *Baronius, Anno 381. 42. Divisus à tempore Juliani, citra tamen Schisma, Oriens ab Occidente, ob Meletium atque Paulinum Catholicos Episcopos Antiochenos*

Time, the Orthodox Bishops of the whole Church communicated together. If they had separated from one another, some Author or other, in that Age which abounded with learned Writers, would certainly have told us of it. But there is no Account of any such Matter. On the contrary, it is notorious, that they communicated together, as I shall prove from a few Instances out of many.

Athanasius died before that Composition. And *Damasus* was made Bishop of Rome after the Consecration of *Paulinus*. And *Athanasius*, in an Epistle written by him at the Head of a Synod of 90 Egyptian and Libyan Bishops, calls *Damasus* his Beloved, and Fellow-Minister, and allows of the Authority of a Synod held under him, and of other Synods in Gaul and Italy (f). So that he manifestly communicated with the Westerns, who acknowledged *Paulinus*. And it is notorious that he communicated with the Easterns, particularly with St. Basil, who was zealous for *Meletius*. For he calls him several times, our Be-

(f) Athanas. Tom. 1. p. 931. ἱκανὸν ἔστιν περὶ γενομένης
ἐν τῇ ἑκκλησίᾳ καὶ συγκατασκευῇ ἡμῶν δαμάσου ἑπισκόπου
καὶ μεγάλου ῥώμης, καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ παρόντων συνελθόντων ἐπισκόπων
ἐν οἷς ἦν ἡμεῖς καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν γενόμενων συνόδων ἐν τῇ Γα-
λίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, καὶ τῶν ὁμοιωσέων πίστεως.

loved Bishop Basil (g); and in one of his Epistles, he thus expresses himself; "I greatly admire at the Boldness of those, who dare to speak against our Beloved, the true Servant of God, Bishop Basil (h)."

St. Basil the Great was made Bishop of *Cæsarea* in the Year 369, and died Jan. 1. 378 (i), before that Composition. He warmly espoused the Cause of *Meletius*, but yet he communicated with all the Orthodox Bishops who acknowledged *Paulinus*. He also communicated with the *Westerns*, as is manifest from several Epistles which he wrote to them. And in an Epistle of his to *Terentius* (k), he gives an account, "that he heard that some of *Paulinus's* Adherents carried about Letters of the *Westerns* brought from *Rome*, wherein the *Westerns* received *Paulinus* as Bishop of *Antioch*, and rejected *Meletius*." And tho' it appears from many Passages in his Works, that he was, and in that very Epistle he expressly calls himself, *One of the Party of the*

(g) *Ibid.* p. 951, 952.

(h) Πάσι ὃ πηρύσσει ἐν ἡμετέρῳ τῷ πατριάρχῳ ἀδελφῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς Ὁ ὡραῖος Οὐὲ δὲας Βασίλειος ὁ ἱεροπόλυς. Ep. ad. Joan. & Antioch. *Ibid.* p. 951.

(i) *Vid.* Baronium in Annis 369 & 378.

(k) *Viz.* Ep. 349. p. 1128

Man of God, Bishop Meletius (l), and stiles Meletius The most admirable Bishop of the true Church of God (m), and asserts, "that those Communicatory Letters brought from Rome could never persuade him, either not to know who Meletius was, or to forget the Church subject to him: Yet since, says he (n), we accuse no Man, and desire to have a Charity for all Men, and especially for those who are of the Household of Faith, we congratulate those Persons who brought those Letters from Rome." And since Basil communicated with those who brought those Letters, there can be no question but he communicated with the Westerns who sent them. More particularly he communicated with Damasus, then Bishop of Rome. For we may conclude, that he was one of the Western Bishops, who sent such Letters, as are said to have been brought from Rome. He also communicated with St. Ambrose, as is manifest from his Epistle to him (o), which was in all Probability a Communicatory

(l) Ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγω. τὸς τὸ μετόιδε. Ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς. Ἐκ τοῦ Μελετίου Ἐπισκόπου, Ibid.

(m) Τὸν θαυμασιώτατον ἐπίσκοπον τὸ ἀληθινὸς Ἐκ τοῦ ἀκατακτάτου Μελέτιου. Ibid.

(n) Πλὴν αὐτὸς ἐπιδοὺς ἀδελφὸς κατηγόρημα. ὅτι δὲ πᾶσις ἔχει εὐχόμεθα τὴν ἀγάπην. καὶ μάλιστα ὅτι τὰς οἰκίας τὸ πᾶσις. συγχωροῦμεν τῇ κοινότητι καὶ τῇ δυνάμει. Ibid. p. 1129.

(o) Vid. Ep. Basilii 55. p. 329.

Letter sent by *Basil* to *Ambrose*, in answer to a Communicatory Letter which *Ambrose* had written to *Basil*, to acquaint him with his being enstated in the See of *Milan*.

In a Word, *St. Basil* himself most expressly testifies, that he communicated with all Orthodox Churches throughout the World, in an Epistle of his to the *Neocesareans*, who happened to have a Difference with him. His Words are these (p).

"It would be more reasonable in you
"to frame your Judgment of us, not
"from one or two, who walk not
"uprightly according to the Truth,
"but from the Multitude of Bishops
"throughout the World, who are join-
"ed to us by the Grace of Christ. En-
"quire into the *Pisidians*, *Lycaonians*,
"Isaurians, *Phrygians*, those *Armenians*

(p) Ep. 75. p. 883. Διακρίνοντες ὃ περὶ ἡμῶν κρίνεται
μὴ ἐξ ἑνὸς ἢ δύο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων, ὡς τὸν ἐκείνου
αἰὲν οὐ παύσας τὸ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐπιστάτων συναγμένων
ἡμῶν χάριν ἔχοντες. Ἐκτεταῶσι δὲ Πισιδίαν, Λυκαόνιαν, Ἰσαυρίαν,
Φρυγίαν, Ἰκονίαν, Ἀρμενίαν, ὅσοι ὑμῶν ἐστὶ κοινωνοί. Μακεδονίαν,
Ἀχαιοί, Ἰλλυριοί, Γαλάται, Ἰσπανοί, Ἰταλὸν σύμπασαν, Σικανίαν,
κλωῆν, Ἀφροί, Αἰγυπτίαν τὸ ὅλον, καὶ Συρίαν ὅλην, Λιβύαν
οἱ πρὸς πέρας ἐστὶν ὡς ἡμῶν ἀντιπροσώπων, καὶ πάλιν διὰ τὴν
παρ' ἡμῶν. ὡς ἐπὶ ὑμῶν ἔστι τὸ ἀντιπαραστήσαντες ὅλην
μάστιγον μαθήν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ ἑνὶ πάλιν ἀντιπροσώπων αὐτοῖς
ἀδελφότητι, ὅτι ἐν ὅλῃ πάντες ἰσχυρὸν τὸ ἐν φρονήσει. ὡς ὁ τῶν
ὡς ἡμῶν προσημαίνει ἀποδοχάσκον, μὴ λαθύνειν ὑμῶν τὴν
ἀρετήν, πείσας ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐκκλησίας ἀποδοχάσκον, ἀδελφότητι
δὲ ἀδελφοί ὡς τίνας ἐπὶ ὑμῶν ἡ κοινότης, ἐκτεταῶν παρ' ἡμῶν
μὴ διεχθῆναι. τίς λοιπὸν ὑμῶν ἐπικρίνει;

" who border upon you, the *Macedoni-*
 " *ans, Achaïans, Illyrians, Gauls, Spaniards,*
 " all *Italy, the Sicilians, the Africans, the*
 " sound part of *Egypt*, what remains of
 " *Syria*; who both send Letters to us,
 " and again receive Letters from us; and
 " from the Letters which come from
 " them, and which are sent back again
 " to them, you may learn, that we are
 " all of one accord, of one Mind. Do
 " not therefore be so weak, as not to
 " perceive, that he who avoids our Com-
 " munion, breaks himself off from the
 " universal Church. Consider therefore,
 " Brethren, whom you will communicate
 " with, after you are rejected by us. Who
 " then will own you?"

We may conclude, that even *Meletius*
 himself, tho' esteemed by the *Westerns* an
 Anti-Bishop, was never formally Excom-
 municated by them; not only, because if
 he had been, *St. Basil* would most cer-
 tainly have mentioned it in some or other
 of the Epistles, wherein he speaks of this
 Matter: but because several of *Basil's*
 Epistles imply the contrary, particularly
 his 69th, and that was written accord-
 ing to *Baronius*, in the Year 371, which
 was Nine Years after the Consecration of
Paulinus, and seven Years before the A-
 greement between him and *Meletius*: but

it was certainly written some time before Basil's Death, and consequently before that Agreement.

That Epistle has this Supercription (7).
 "To the Beloved of God, and Most
 "Holy Brethren, the Bishops, our Fel-
 "low-Ministers, and who are of one
 "Mind with us throughout Italy and
 "Gaul, Meletius, Eusebius, (of Samosata),
 "Basil, and the rest send greeting in the
 "Lord." The Design of it is to excite
 the *Westerns* to send some Legates to sup-
 port the *Easterns* against the *Arians*. And
 Basil's 74th Epistle seems plainly to speak
 of an Answer, which the *Westerns* sent
 to this 69th Epistle. And it appears
 next to certain also from other Epistles
 of Basil, that this 69th Epistle was re-
 ceived and answered by the *Westerns*,
 or else that Meletius concurred in sending
 several other Epistles and Messages to
 the *Westerns*, which were received and
 answered (7).

From this Epistle it is in the first place
 manifest, that Meletius did not judge the

(7) Pag. 856. Τοις φιλοτάτοις καὶ ἀγαπαιωμένοις ἀδελφοῖς
 ἐπισκοποῖς καὶ τῶν Ἰταλῶν καὶ Γαλιῶν ἁποστόλοις καὶ κληρικοῖς
 Μελῆτιος, Εὐσεβίου, Βασίλειου, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὁμοθυμῶν
 χαίρειν.

(7) Confer Epistolas Basilii 10, 53, 57, 58, 61, 70,
 74, 199.

Westerns Schismatics, tho' he undoubtedly thought them guilty of wrongfully rejecting his Episcopal Authority, and of acknowledging a wrongful Anti-Bishop in opposition to him. Next this shews, that the *Westerns* had not excommunicated *Meletius*. For they could not excommunicate him without his knowing of it. And if he had known of it, he would never have written as he does. He writes to them as Fellow-Communicants. He calls them, *Bishops, Brethren, Fellow-Ministers, Most Holy, Beloved of God, Men of the same Mind*; and he desires Assistance of them. Now if they had declared him a Schismatick, he would never have given them such Titles; and it is not probable, that he would have requested their Assistance. And supposing that he had wished for it, he would certainly have thought it more advisable not to have written to them himself, but to have suffered those other Bishops, with whom the *Westerns* communicated, to have written without him.

In particular *Meletius* was not excommunicated by *Damasus* the Chief of the *Western* Bishops, but had some sort of Communion with him. About the Year 374, or later, St. *Jerom* wrote two Epistles from the *East* to *Damasus*, to know whom he should communicate with as Bishop

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 459

Bishop of *Antioch*. In the latter of them he has these Expressions. "*Meletius, Vitalis* and *Paulinus* say, that they adhere here to you. If only one of them said so, I could believe him: Now at least Two, if not all of them tell a Falshood *." This fully proves, that *Meletius* asserted, that he had at least some Communion with *Damasus*. And it is not probable, that a Man of *Meletius's* Character would assert a Falshood. Indeed *Jerome* thought it impossible, that more than one of them could have any Communion with *Damasus*, because only one of them could be acknowledged by him, as Bishop of *Antioch*: and therefore he concluded that two of them must be guilty of Falshood. And it is no Wonder he should think so. Because ordinarily the Primitive Christians had no sort of Ecclesiastical Communion with such Bishops, whose Authority they disowned. But that there was no real impossibility in the thing, is manifest, because it is a-

* *Meletius, Vitalis atque Paulinus tibi hærere se dicunt. Possem credere, si hoc unus assereret; nunc aut duo mentiuntur, aut omnes.* The former of these Epistles speaks of *Ambrose* as Bishop of *Milan*, and therefore must be written after his Consecration, which was in the Year 374. *Vid. Hieron. Tom. 2. p. 131--134. Edit. Brasen.*

greed, that after the Composition between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, both of them were admitted to Communion by the same Catholick Bishops. And I shall hereafter shew, that both *Flavian* and *Evagrius* were, at least for some time, admitted to Communion by the *Westerns*. It may be also objected, that this is as strong a Proof, that *Damasus* had not broken off Communion with *Vitalis*, who was an *Apollinarian*. To which I answer, that it does not seem certain, that *Damasus* had excommunicated *Vitalis* before the Writing of this Letter: and it is most probable that he did it afterward; because *Jerom* appears ignorant of it. Besides, it is much less reasonable to suppose, that *Meletius* that glorious Confessor would be guilty of a Falshood, than *Vitalis*: who had grossly equivocated in a Profession of Faith which he made in order to be admitted to Communion (f).

This also confirms that *Meletius* had some Communion with *Damasus*, that about the Year 378, when the Emperor *Gratian* commanded the Churches to be restored to those who communicated with *Damasus*: in pursuance of this Decree, the

(f) *Vid.* Greg. Nazianz. ad Cledonium ad. Apollin. Ep. 2. Tom. 1. p. 745.

Churches possessed in *Antioch* by the *Arians*, were delivered to *Meletius*. And this seems an authentick Proof that *Meletius* communicated with *Damasus*, at least in some sort. And this was before the Composition between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*. For *Theodoret* acquaints us, that *Meletius*, at the very Time when the Churches were delivered to him, proposed to compound the Dispute between him and *Paulinus*, and that *Paulinus* refused. Some imagine, that this Account of *Theodoret* is not true, because *Paulinus* did consent to compound the Matter. But there is no Absurdity in supposing, that *Paulinus* should refuse to consent at that Time, and should afterwards be brought to yield. And it is certain from *Secrates* and *Sozomen*, that when it was first moved, that *Paulinus* and *Meletius* should be joint Bishops of *Antioch*, *Paulinus* rejected the Proposal; and consequently might also reject it a second time.

When *Meletius* was dead, and *Flavian* consecrated in his Room, in opposition to *Paulinus*: Those who acknowledged one Rival, still communicated with those who acknowledged the other. Upon *Meletius's* Death it was moved in the OEcumenical Council of *Constantinople*, that there should be a new Bishop of *Antioch*, in opposition

to

to *Paulinus*, and *Gregory Nazianzen* zealously opposed that Motion; and when he could not prevail, he withdrew out of the Synod (1). Yet he never deserted the Communion of those who acknowledged *Flavian*; but communicated with them, particularly with *Nectarius* of *Constantinople*, the principal Bishop among them; as is manifest from several Epistles of his to *Nectarius*, especially from the 227th, wherein he highly commends *Nectarius*, and recommends to him the Cause of Bishop *Bosporius*; and thus concludes (u); "I beseech you to pray
 " for me, who am much burthened with
 " Infirmary. I, and all who are with me,
 " salute the Brotherhood which is with
 " you. May God preserve you to us,
 " who are the common support of the
 " Churches: and may he grant you Health,
 " Chearfulness and Reputation."

Theophilus Patriarch of *Alexandria* was at the Head of those *Easterns* who rejected *Flavian*, but he constantly com-

(1) Vid. *Gregorii Operum* Tom. 2. p. 25—28. in *Carminibus de Vita sua*. Edit. Paris, 1630.

(u) *Greg. Nazianz. Tom. 1. p. 913, 914.* Ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
 σφάδίζου, παρεκκαλῶ, σφίδρα κομνόντων τῇ ἀφρώτῃ. τῇ σὺν
 σοὶ ἀδελφότητι ἐγὼ τι καὶ οἱ σὺν ἡμῶν πάντες σπασμαρξομεθα. Εὐ-
 χαρισθῶμεν, εὐδοκῶμεν, εὐδοκίμα ἐν κυρίῳ χαρισθείης ἡμεῖς, ᾧ ἐν-
 κλησῶν τὸ πρὸν στήριγμα.

municated with those who owned him ; of which I shall give this remarkable Proof. *John Chrysostom* was ordained Deacon by *Meletius*, and Presbyter by *Flavian* (w) : and it is notorious from several of his Homilies, that he continued to adhere to *Flavian*. And yet *Theophilus* communicated with him. Nay, tho' he warmly contended, that his Presbyter *Isidorus* should be made Bishop of Constantinople ; yet *Sozomen* (x) says, he consented to *John's* Consecration, for fear of *Eutropius*, a great Courtier, who was zealous for it. *Palladius* seems to have been unwilling to own, that his Patron was Consecrated by *Theophilus*. But in one Place (y) he confesses, that *Theophilus* was present ; and he does not tell us that any other Person Consecrated him ; tho' he had before particularly related, by whom he was ordained Presbyter and Deacon, which were not so considerable Circumstances in *John's* Life, as by whom he was Consecrated. And in another Place

(w) Pallad. p. 42.

(x) L. 8. c. 2. Συνέλαυν ὁ ἡγόρευεν (ὁ βασιλεὺς) καὶ τὸ εὐ-
σεβὲς ἀποστρέφει τὴν χειροτονίαν (ἰωάννη) διὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς
ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ συνελθόντων, ἐμποδὼν ἐγείνη τῇ χειροτονίᾳ Θεοφι-
λου. Ἰσχυρῶς σκευάζει. ἀλλὰ πλούσιον, συνέλαυν τὸν ἰω-
άννην διδοῦναι. ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς τῇ χειροτονίᾳ ἐκδοῦναι
δίδωκεν. Εὐσεβίου.

(y) Pallad. p. 43. Προχρὸν αὐτῷ (ἰωάννη) τῇ ἐκείνῃ,
ἐψυχάζει πρὸς τὴν χειροτονίαν.

he seems to imply, that *Theophilus* Consecrated him (z). And *Socrates* expressly tells us (a), that *Theophilus* did Consecrate him.

As to the *Western* Bishops, it is also notorious, that tho' they rejected *Flavian*, yet they did not break off Communion with those who owned him. Indeed *Sozomen* says (b), that the *Westerns* held *Diodorus of Tarsus* and *Acacius of Berea*, who Consecrated *Flavian*, excommunicated. But since *Diodorus* and *Acacius* are particularly named, and it is said, that the *Westerns* held them excommunicated, not because they received *Flavian*, but because they consecrated him: this strongly confirms, that the *Westerns* did not hold those other *Eastern* Bishops excommunicated, who are not particularly named, and who did not Consecrate *Flavian*.

It would be endless to mention every particular Bishop who communicated with both Parties: because there is no question but they generally did it. And their doing

(z) P. 44. Διάκ. Πρὸς τὴν ἑκκλῆσιαν (Θεοφίλου) τῆς χερσονήσου: ὁ δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκκλῆσιαι τοῖς μὴ χερσονήσου τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς χερσονήσου ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς σταυροπόλεως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖται.

(a) L. 6. c. 2. Ὁ Θεοφίλος τῆς ἰουδαίας ἐκκομμεῖται.

(b) L. 7. c. 11. Τὸς ἀπὸ Διόδωρον τῆς ταρσῆ καὶ Ἀκακίον τῆς βερραίας τοὺς αὐτὸν χερσονήσου καὶ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἀνατολῆς ἐκκομμεῖται.

it generally is of the same Force, as if they had made a Synodical Declaration that it was lawful so to do. Since, as I have proved (c), the Sense of the Episcopal College is of the same Force, however it be signified, whether in Synods or separately. But to shew that nothing is wanting to give Weight to this Precedent, I observe farther, that after the Bishops of the Catholick Church had thus communicated with both Parties for many Years, their Proceeding was approved of by a formal Synod, and established into a Canon. For the Synod of *Capua* decreed, "that
" All throughout the whole *East*, who
" confessed the Catholick Faith, not ex-
" cepting *Evagrius* and *Flavian* them-
" selves, should be admitted to Commu-
" nion, and the Examination of the Cause
" of *Evagrius* and *Flavian* should be refer-
" red to *Theophilus* and the *Egyptian* Bi-
" shops (d)." Now this Synod must be held some time after *Evagrius* had suc-

(c) *Supra*, p. 8, &c.

(d) Ut omnibus per totum orientem daretur Commu-
nio Catholicam confitentibus fidem, & duobus istis tunc
sanctitatis examen impertiretur, fratribus & confacerdo-
ribus nostris *Aegyptiis* pariter confitentibus, quia hoc ve-
rum judicium futurum arbitrati sumus, quod neutri parti
fociata communione aliquo favore propenderet. *Vid.*
Ambrosii, Epist. 78. ad Theophilum. Tom. 3. p. 191.

ceeded *Paulinus*. And *Paulinus* died, according to *Baronius*, in the Year 389, after *Flavian* had been consecrated about Eight Years.

Lastly, *Paulinus* and *Evagrius* were the Principals of one Party. And it is manifest, that tho' the Generality of the *Easterns* judged them to be wrongful Bishops, yet they did not declare them to be Schismatics; because, as I have before had occasion to observe (e), they inserted their Names in the Diptychs, and thereby implied, that they did not die under any lawful Sentence of Excommunication.

Indeed some of the *Easterns*, particularly *St. Basil*, avoided the Communion of *Paulinus*. But it appears that at that time they mistook him for a *Sabellian* (f). And on the other Hand *Socrates* (g), and *Sozomen* (h) relate, that the *Westerns* would not communicate with *Flavian*, nor with those who ordained him. But then we must consider, that the Reason of this was, be-

(e) *Supra*, p. 330.

(f) *Vid. Basilii Epist.* 349. p. 1129 & *Ep.* 74. p. 876.

(g) *L.* 5. c. 15.

(h) *Soz.* *L.* 7. c. 11. Οἱ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱερεῖς Παυλίῳ καὶ αἰς ἐπισκόποις Ἀντιοχείας καὶ ἐπισκόποις Ἱερραφῶν συνδοχῆς ὡς ὁ Φλαβιανὸν σιωπῇ ἔχον καὶ τὸς ἀμφὶ Διδύμω καὶ Ταρσῷ καὶ Ἀκάνιον τῇ Βιρσίᾳ καὶ αὐτὸν χειροτονήσαντας ἀκριβοῦς εἶχον.

cause the Agreement that the Survivor of the two Rivals, *Paulinus* and *Meletius*, should enjoy the See of *Antioch* without a Rival, had been Synodically confirmed (i). And after all it is not probable, that the *Westerns* formally excommunicated *Flavian* or his Ordainers. For no Author relates, that they did. *Sozomen* says, *They sent their Synodical Letter to Paulinus, but kept Silence as to Flavian*. Now if they had excommunicated *Flavian*, they would not have kept Silence with Regard to him. *Sozomen* adds, that *they held his Ordainers Excommunicated*, i. e. They esteemed and treated them as such; which implies, that they were not actually excommunicated. Indeed from hence I conclude, that as they sent no Synodical Letters to *Flavian*; so they received none from him or his Ordainers; otherwise it would not have been true, that *they held them Excommunicated*.

Sozomen

(i) *Concilii Aquileiensis Epist. ad. Theodos. numero secunda inter Epistolas Conciliorum a Sirmondo editas. Oblatas Pietati vestrae opinamur preces nostras quibus juxta partium factum (l. pactum) poposcimus, ut altero decedente penes superstitem ecclesie permanerent, nec aliqua superordinatio attentaretur. And in the Conclusion of that Epistle the Council seems to say, that the Churches of Gaul and Africa, as well as of Italy, desired that that*

468 A TREATISE against the

Sozomen also says (k), " that the Egyptian
 " and Western Bishops differed with those
 " of the East, because of Paulinus, and
 " that there was some common Breach
 " on this Account, throughout all the
 " Churches of the Roman Empire: and
 " that at length, when this Difference
 " was ended, the Churches returned to
 " Communion with one another." But
 Sozomen only means, that some Churches
 forbore to communicate with one Antio-
 chian Rival, and some with another; and
 that tho' the Westerns and Easterns commu-
 nicated together; for Instance, the We-
 sterns communicated with those of the Pa-
 triarchate of Constantinople; yet they did not
 communicate with all those with whom
 that Patriarchate communicated; and con-
 sequently there was not a full and perfect
 Communion between them. There was

Agreement should be observed. Ibid. Ep. Concilii Italice
 ad Theodos. numero 5. Scripseramus dudum ut quoniam
 Antiochena Civitas duos haberet Episcopos, Paulinum at-
 que Melitium, quos fidei concinere putabamus, aut inter
 ipsos Pax & Concordia salvo ordine ecclesiastico conve-
 nirer, aut certe si quis eorum altero superstite decessisset,
 nulla subrogatio in defuncti locum superstite altero gigne-
 retur. At nunc, Melitio defuncto, Paulino superstite,
 contra fas atque ecclesiasticum ordinem, non tam subro-
 gatus, quam superpositus asseritur.

(k) L. 8. c. 3. Καινὴς πρὸς ἀριζίας ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν
 τὸ ὑπάρχον ἐκκλησίας καταχρῶνται. Et infra, Αἱ μὲν ἐκκλησίαι
 ὁψέονται αὐτῆς τὴν διχονομίαν ἀδελφικῶς ἀπαγαγεῖν τὴν αὐτῆς ἀδελφίας
 Κοινωνίαν ἀπέλατον.

some

some Breach, as *Sozomen* expresses it (1), tho' not a general Breach of Communion between the *Easterns* and *Westerns*. For it appears from the Practice of the Primitive Christians, that there were several degrees of Communion or Discommunion. The highest degree of Discommunion was to excommunicate Men, and declare them Schismatics, and to esteem those who communicated with them, Schismatics by Contagion. *Victor* excommunicated the *Asians*, and yet kept Peace with *Irenaeus*, who continued to communicate with them. And in like manner, *Innocent* Bishop of *Rome* excommunicated the Adversaries of *Chrysostom*, and yet did not divide from the *Africans* who kept Peace with them. The *Westerns* did never formally excommunicate *Flavian*; and yet they sent no Communicatory Letters to him, nor received any from him. And with respect to *Meletius*, they were so far from excommunicating him, that, in all probability they received Communicatory Letters from him, tho' perhaps they sent none directly to him. As to most of the other *Eastern* Bishops, the *Westerns* wrote Communicatory Letters to them,

(1) Τὴν ἀπορίαν.

and received such Letters from them. Yet, as I have before observed, *probably* they did not send Communicatory Letters to *Meletius*, and it is *certain* they did not send such Letters to *Flavian*, both whom the *Easterns* owned and wrote to, as successively Bishops of *Antioch*. On the contrary, the *Westerns* wrote to *Paulinus* and *Evagrius*, whom the *Easterns* disowned. But full and perfect Communion with a Bishop was, when they received Communicatory Letters from him, and wrote such Letters to him; and wrote in like manner to all those with whom he communicated, and to them only.

In short then, for about Forty Years the Bishops of the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches communicated together, tho' some of them owned one of the *Antiochian* Bishops, and some, the other. And the *Westerns*, tho' they judged *Paulinus* to be the rightful Bishop, did not excommunicate *Meletius*, the Principal of the other Party. And on the other Hand, tho' the *Easterns* judged *Paulinus* and *Evagrius* to be wrongful Bishops, yet by admitting them into their Diptychs, they confessed, that they did not die under any lawful Sentence of Excommunication. And therefore they were then so far from thinking, that all who communicated with Anti-Bishops

Bishops must necessarily be Schismatics, that many of them did not believe all Anti-Bishops to be compleat Schismatics, till they were Synodically condemned. And this was not in a late, dark and ignorant Age: but in the Fourth Century, and when there were as many great and learned, and holy Men in the Church, as perhaps ever flourished in any Age. For Instance, St. *Atbanasius* the Great, St. *Basil* the Great, the Great *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, St. *Hilary* of *Poitiers*, St. *Ambrose* of *Milan*, *Titus* of *Bosra*, St. *Damasus*, St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Gregory Nyssen*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Amphilochius*, St. *Jerom*, *Diodorus* of *Tarsus*, St. *John Chrysostom*, and many others.

The Case also of St. *John Chrysostom*, which our Adversaries are so fond of, is full against them in this Point. I have before observed (m), that the *Africans* did not break off Communion, either with the *Italians* who adhered to *John* notwithstanding his Deposition, or with the *Easterns*, who received *Arsacius* and *Atticus*, successively constituted in *John's* room: tho' the *Africans* must have known, that one or the other side was in the wrong.

(m) *Supra*, p. 311, 312.

If then they thought *Atticus* to be a wrongful Bishop; they judged, that wrongful Bishops, and those who communicate with them, are not necessarily Schismatics. If they thought *Atticus* to be a Rightful Bishop, then they judged, that a Man might in some Cases break off Communion with Rightful Bishops, as *Innocent* did with *Theophilus* and *Atticus*; and yet not be a Schismatick till he was Synodically condemned. And on the other Hand, tho' *Innocent* excommunicated the *Anti-Joannites*, yet he continued to communicate with the *Africans* who kept Peace with them.

But which is more considerable, tho' *Innocent* and other *Italian* Bishops were zealous Friends of *John*, and thought him to be wrongfully deposed, and that *Arsacius* and *Atticus* wrongfully succeeded him, yet they did not break off Communion with his Deposers, till a considerable Time after the *Joannites* had separated from them; nay, not till some time after even *Atticus* was constituted in his room.

After *John's* second Deposition, the Bishops and others of his Adherents communicated with him, till about the *Easter* following (n). Then the Emperor com-

(n) *Vid.* Pallad. p. 80, 81.

manded *John* to leave the Church ; and thereupon the *Joannites* also left the Churches (o), and assembled in a separate Congregation (p). And the Soldiers dispersed them by Force, and their Clergy were imprisoned, and those of Dignity among their Laity were cast out of *Constantinople* (q). And several Edicts were published one after another, requiring Men on divers Penalties, to renounce Communion with *John* (r). But all those Severities were without Success. For the *Joannites* continued their separate Meetings, and increased in Number (s). And this Disturbance was not confined to the Diocese of *Constantinople*, but extended as far as the *East*, strictly so called, throughout which the Clergy opposed their Bishops, and several of the Laity separated (t).

(o) *Ibid.* p. 84. Οὐδ' αὖ ἵμενοι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. κ. τ. λ.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 83, 86; and *Chrysostom* writes, *ibid.* p. 19. Πᾶσι τῇ πόλει ἔξω τείχεσι μετωκίσε, ὑπὸ δυνάμει καὶ ἰσχύϊ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκπαύσαντες. *Add.* Soc. L. 6. c. 18.

(q) *Ibid.* p. 85—88.

(r) P. 86. Διατίγχετο ὁ ἀντιπάλαιος κατὰ τόπον ἀντιτίθητο, ἀφ' ὧν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἐπὶ ἀρίστης τῇ κοινότητι ἰωάννου. P. 88. Μάλιστα καὶ τριβλάσεις καὶ ἄλλαι φρενὲς εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἀντιτίθεντο ἐπὶ ἀντιπαρθενοῦ ἰωάννου.

(s) *Ibid.* p. 86.

(t) *Ibid.* p. 20. Κληροὶ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἰωάννου καὶ λοιποὶ, οἱ μὲν διατμήσαντες, οἱ δὲ μένουσιν.

Here was a Division with a Witness, and a Separation intirely formed. Now *John* wrote an Account of all this to *Innocent* (u). And he in answer returned communicatory Letters, not only to him, but to his Adversaries, tho' he disapproved of their Proceedings (w). After this he received from *Theophilus* the Acts of the Synod which had deposed *John*. And having read them, he continually expressed the greatest Contempt and Abhorrence of *Theophilus's* Madnes, for so *Palladius* words it (x), in proceeding so irregularly. Yet still he did not break with him, but sent him another Communicatory Letter (y).

Indeed when they sent Letters, accusing *John* of having burned the Cathedral Church of *Constantinople*, (which just as *John* had taken his final Leave of it, had taken Fire and been burned down, whether by Accident or Design, is uncertain); it appeared to *Innocent* so false an Acculation, that he did not think fit

(u) *Ibid.* p. 18, 19, 20.

(w) *Ibid.* p. 22. Πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιπάλους ὁ ἡγούμενος Ἰννοκέντιος ὁ πᾶσις μυστήριος τοῖς μίσησι καὶ τοῖς κατηγόριαις, ἀποκρίσεις τῇ δοξαζομένῃ γυναικὶ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις Θεοφίλῳ.

(x) *Ibid.* p. 23. Ἐπεὶ ἐκπεσούσῃ τῇ Θεοφίλῳ ραβδίᾳ.

(y) That Letter begins thus. Ἀδελφὶ Θεόφιλε, ὑμεῖς καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ συνωνοὶ καὶ τὸ ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννην. *Ibid.* p. 24.

to answer their Letters (z). But after that, and after *Arsacius* was constituted Bishop of Constantinople in John's room, and there was an Edict published by *Arcadius*, that whosoever refused to communicate with *Arsacius*, should be expelled from his Bishoprick (a). Nay, for some time after *Arsacius* was dead, and *Articus* was consecrated, neither *Innocent* nor the other Italian Bishops had broken off Communion with John's Adversaries.

For a good while after *Innocent* had Notice of the Publication of that Edict, he laid John's Cause before *Honorius*, who thereupon commanded an Italian Synod to be assembled, that they might advise him what was to be done. And they desired him to write to *Arcadius*, that there might be an OEcumenical Synod of Eastern and Western Bishops to pass such a Sentence upon this Affair, as cou'd not be controverted (b); which manifestly supposes, that they thought that such a Sentence had not yet passed, and that the Matter might be yet controverted. And

(z) *Ibid.* p. 25.

(a) Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοφίλου ἐν Ἀρκαδίῳ ἐν Πορφυρίῳ, ὁ πῦρ τὸ ἄλλο ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐργάσθη. *Ibid.* p. 26.

(b) Ἀναμφίλεκτον ἐκτελεσθῆναι ψήφω. *Ibid.* p. 29.

476 A TREATISE against the

Honorius wrote to Arsacius, to receive well the Legates whom that Synod had sent, that if they should be convinced that John was justly deposed, they might teach him (Honorius), to break off Communion with John; or if they should convict the Eastern Bishops of having wilfully wronged John, they might dissuade Arcadius from communicating with them (c): which also plainly implies, that tho' the Westerns were persuaded of the Justice of John's Cause, they did not yet esteem themselves sufficiently convinced of it; and that Honorius was not finally determined, whether he ought to break off Communion with John or no. Lastly, the Bishops of this Synod sent Letters to Constantinople, and a Commonitory, declaring their Opinion, that before John was tried, (viz. by the OEcumenical Synod proposed by them) he ought to be restored to his Church and to Communion (d). And this also argues, that they had not yet

(c) Ibid. p. 30. Ἰν' εἰ μὴ περὶ τούτου, ὅτι περὶ δικαίας ἐκεί-
 νων τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν Ἰωάννης διδάσκει μὴ διαστῆναι τὴν αὐτῆς
 κοινωνίαν· ἢ ἐλέγχοντες ἐβλοκακύνοντες τὰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν ἐπισκόπους,
 ἀπετρέψοντες αὐτοὺς τὴν αὐτῶν κοινωνίαν.

(d) Ibid. p. 31. Μὴ δεῖν εἰσελθεῖν Ἰωάννην εἰς κρίσιν, ἵνα
 μὴ ὡς πρὸς ἀποκαταστάσιν αὐτοῦ ᾗται ἐκκλησία καὶ ἡ κοινωνία.

broken off Communion with *John's* Deposers. For if they had, they would not have been so absurd, as to have desired Persons whose Communion they had forsaken, to restore *John* to their Communion; but would have exhorted them to return to Communion with *John*. It is therefore plain, that the *Italians* had not broken off Communion with *John's* Adversaries, when they sent this Commonitory; and we may be sure they did not break off Communion with them, till their Legates were returned, and had informed them, whether the *Easterns* would regard their Representation, and comply with their Proposal or no. Now while these Legates were at *Constantinople*, they understood that *Atticus* was in Possession of that See (e). And he was made Patriarch of that See two Years after the Separation of *John's* Adherents, and the Publication of Edicts, requiring Men to renounce Communion with him; and seventeen Months at least after *Arsacius* had been made Bishop of *Constantinople* (f).

How

(e) Pallad. p. 33. Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλάττω ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς Ἱερῆς καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλησίας. And in the next Words the Legates are said to have been desired, κοινῶς τῆς Ἀπὸ τοῦ.

(f) The *Joannites* separated, and those Edicts were published about Easter, April 404. (Pallad. p. 33. Soc. H. E.

How long after this it was, before *Innocent* divided from the *Easterns*, does not certainly appear; But thus far is clear, that he did not break off Communion with them, till after *Arsacius* had succeeded *John*, and been himself succeeded by *Atticus*, nor till a Synod had been assembled at *Rome*, and had come to a Determination, which had been contemned and rejected by the *Easterns*. So that they did not then date Schism, as our Adversaries do (g), from the Consecration of Bishops, whom they esteemed Usurpers; but from a Synodical Sentence, declaring them Schismaticks, or from their refusing to be tried by a Synod.

Perhaps our Adversaries may here object, as they do in another Case, "that supposing this Plea to be good, when and where Synods can be had, it does

H. E. L. 6. c. 18.) And *John* was carried the second Time into Banishment, the 20th of *June* following (*Ibid. Vid. Pallad. p. 83.*) And *Arsacius* was made Patriarch in *September*, in the same Year. For he died in *Nov. 405.* (*Socrat. L. 6. c. 20.*) And he was Patriarch Fourteen Months (*Pallad. p. 94. Cod. Baroc. p. 5.*) And *Socrates* (*L. 6. c. 20.*) tells us, that *Atticus* was made Patriarch a great while after *Arsacius's* Death; but *Sozomen* (*L. 8. c. 27.*) tells us, that he was made Patriarch the Fourth Month after, *i. e. February 406.*

(g) *Vid. Dr. Hickes, p. 29.*

"NOT

"not hold when and where they cannot
"be had (b)."

Ans. 1. The plain Meaning of this is, that where we have no Authority to treat others as Schismatics, we may, nay must, treat them as such, without Authority to do so. Whereas even when Synods might have been held, as in the Case of *Melarius* and *Flavian*, the Church has thought she lawfully might, and ought in Christian Prudence, to leave the Criminals to God. And it is manifestly not only Prudence but Justice, to leave supposed Criminals to God, when there is no competent Judge to determine, whether they have done the Facts whereof they are accused, and whether those Facts be criminal or no.

Indeed in Matters essential to Christianity, as when a Bishop notoriously preaches Heresy, and no Synod can be had to condemn him, there private Christians must break off Communion with him. But it appears from what I have already produced, that the Primitive Fathers did not think it necessary to leave the Communion of a wrongful Diocesan Bishop, before he was Synodically con-

(b) *Vid. Dr. Hickes, p. 229.*

demned as such; and much less, to leave the Communion of those who acknowledged such a Bishop.

Answ. 2. This is by no means our Case. For I have already shewn, that the consent given by our Bishops to the Depriving Acts, both in and out of Parliament, is the same thing in Reality, as a Synodical Deprivation. And we have actually had many Synods held. And the Deprived Bishops did never (that I can learn) appear in those Synods, or offer to appear, or demand to be admitted, or to have their Cause tried.

But when Dr. *Hickes* says a Synod cannot be had, he means such a Synod as would assert the Rightfulness of the Cause of the *Nonconforming Nonjurors*. For he argues, that Men ought to forsake our Churches on Account of Doctrines which he supposes to be erroneous, notwithstanding our Bishops are not Synodically condemned for those Doctrines, *because a Synod cannot be had*. And that a Synod cannot be had, he thus proves. *You cannot imagine, that a Synod of Bishops teaching false Doctrines, should condemn themselves*. Which is just as if a Man who had a bad Cause should say, that no Justice could be had, and that no Judges could be found: meaning thereby,

by, no Judges who would give the Cause for him.

Thus I have shewn that in the Time of *Irenaus*, and afterward of *Firmilian* and *Cyprian*, the Church did not, before Synodical Condemnation, esteem such Bishops Schismatics, who had unjustly excommunicated their Fellow Bishops. And he who excommunicates a Bishop unjustly, rejects and denies his Rightful Authority as well as he who sets up Altar against Altar. And when Altar has been formally set up against Altar, as during the Controversy between *Meletius* and *Flavian*, and their Rivals, which lasted about Forty Years: Part of the Catholick Bishops took one side, and Part the other; but they did not all this while judge one another to be Schismatics, for communicating with those whom they respectively esteemed wrongful Bishops: Nay, they did not always excommunicate even those very Bishops whom they thought to be wrongful ones. And lastly, when *Chrysostom* was deposed, neither *Innocent* nor the *Western* Bishops broke off Communion with his Deposers, and consequently they did not judge them Schismatics, till the Determination of the *Roman* Synod had been rejected, which was seventeen Months at least.

after *Arsacius* had been put in *John's* Place.

And yet, in most of these Instances, it was obvious who was in the wrong. *Victor* and *Stephen* were palpably criminal, in respectively excommunicating the *Asians* and *St. Cyprian*. According to the Historical Collector it is manifest, that *Paulinus* had no Right to set up against *Meletius*; nor *Flavian* against *Paulinus*, after *Paulinus* was become a Rightful Bishop, by means of the abovementioned Composition between him and *Meletius*. Our Adversaries also think it undoubted, that the Deposers of *Chrysostom* were in the wrong.

Since then in every one of these Cases, the Persons offending were not excommunicated nor declared Schismaticks, and much less were they who communicated with them declared Schismaticks before a Synod had taken Cognizance of their Cause: And since our Case, supposing us to be mistaken, is more doubtful than most of these, and depends on various Questions of Fact and Doctrine, which have never yet been Authoritatively decided against us; and since our Adversaries continually appeal to Primitive Practice, particularly as to this very Point: It is unwarrantable and inexcusable in them

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 483

them to pronounce the Successors of the Deprived Bishops Schismaticks, since they never were Synodically condemn'd as such, but on the contrary were in Effect Synodically approved. And much more is it a high Presumption in *them*, who are only private Men, to pronounce many Colleges of Bishops Schismaticks, for having communicated with such Successors.





A N
A N S W E R
T O

*The Case of Schism in the Church of
England truly stated,*

Paragraph by Paragraph.

I Have taken Occasion in the foregoing Discourse, to answer all the Objections I could meet with particularly those made in Dr. *Hickes's* late posthumous Book. But since the Author of *The Case of Schism* owns (i), that he designed his Discourse chiefly for ordinary Capacities, it may be proper to answer it Paragraph by Paragraph, that ordinary Capacities may perceive, that there is no Reasoning in it but what is false and inconclusive, and that there is very little even of such Reasoning, the

(i) *Pag. 6.*

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 485

Treatise almost wholly consisting of *Supposals* instead of *Proofs*.

Our Author begins with representing the Odiousness and Danger of Schism, and how ignorant Men are of the Nature of Christian Communion. But all he writes upon this Subject, reflects upon himself and his Adherents; since I have already fully proved, that the Church of *England*, as by Law Establish'd, under His present Majesty King *GEORGE*, is not guilty of Schism, but only the *Nonjurors*, who groundlessly separate from her.

P. 1, 2. "By the Church they (the *Nonconforming Nonjurors*) understand the "True Old Church of *England*, with all "her venerable Doctrines of Faith, Justice, and moral Honesty."

Answ. Here our Author, according to his usual Modesty, does, without any Proof, insinuate no less an Accusation of us, than that we are guilty of casting off the Doctrines of Faith, Justice and Honesty.

"(The Church of *England*) with all "her strict Decrees against Resisting, "Deposing and Forfeiting Doctrines."

Answ. The Canons and Articles stand just as they did: and if some few private Persons had maintained contrary Doctrines,

this would not have proved, that the Constitution of the Church was altered. But I have already shewn, that the Doctrine of the Abdication, which was without doubt chiefly levelled at by our Author, does no more imply, that it is lawful to resist a Rightful Prince, than the asserting, that a Bishop may depose himself by preaching Heresy, implies the Lawfulness of disobeying true Bishops.

Our Author proceeds, "The Church of *England*, with all her plain primitive Doctrines of Christian Honesty and Simplicity against Equivocations and Mental Reservations, and which always abhorred Treason and Perjury."

Answ. I know of none who are guilty of Treason, Perjury, Equivocations and Mental Reservations, but those formerly secret and since declared Friends of our Author, who took all the Oaths to the present Government for near 30 Years together, but upon the first Opportunity rose up in Arms against it. I mean such as Mr. *Paul* and Mr. *Hall*, and I think, out of respect to the Memory of those *Martyrs* for the Nonjuring Schism, as they call themselves, he ought to have been less severe in his Reflections upon Perjury.

P. 2. "This pure Virgin Church which may be said once more to be driven into
" the

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 487

"the Wilderness." And again: "Like
"the Church of Jerusalem in the first
"Persecution of Christianity." And to
the same Purpose, p. 4, 7, 27.

Ans. Our Author delights to enlarge
upon the *Persecution* (as he calls it) of the
Nonjurors, hoping thereby to move Com-
passion, which is a great Step towards
Approbation. Whereas it is well known,
that the *Nonjurors*, though declared Ene-
mies of the Government, have been pro-
tected in their Persons and Liberties; as
well as the best of Subjects, while they
forbore putting their Principles into Pra-
ctice, and did not endeavour actually to
disturb our Peace. And this is so far
from being a State of Persecution, that I
believe, no other Government in the
World would suffer its profess'd Ene-
mies to live so easily under it. But if they
call it Persecution, for the Government to
defend it self from their Attempts, when
they rise up in Arms, or under Religious
Pretences gather Assemblies, against the
State; they should know, that all Pére-
cutions do not merit Compassion: else
Highway-Men and Murderers would be
entitled to it; but only the being *Perse-
cuted for Righteousness Sake*: which they
cannot prove to be their Case.

P. 3. "In answer to the great Emphasis, which to supply want of Argument, their Enemies put upon separating from the Publick."

Answ. To supply want of Argument. One should expect, that he who reproaches us with *want of Argument*, would not be deficient in it himself; especially in so weighty a Matter, and when he treats us so very roughly. He tells us, that the *odious Names of Separatists and Schismatics belong to us*, that we are *unnatural Renegados, and glory in our Wickedness (k)*. And who are they whom he uses so freely?

Our King himself, a wise and powerful Prince; out of Regard to whom Papists have suspended their persecuting Temper, and deliver'd into Liberty the Confessors for the Protestant Religion; and several Princes have thought fit, without any War, to yield to him great Advantages in Treaties. From the *Baltick* round to the *Mediterranean*, his Dictates are rever'd. Surely then such a Prince ought to have been treated with Decency, even by his Enemies, especially by such as our Author, who pretend to pay a more than ordinary deference to Sovereign Princes.

(k) P. 1, 2, 24, and in other Places.

Archbishops and Bishops, Apostolical in their Piety, Government and Doctrine: and indeed a whole Body of Clergy, Exemplary in their Lives, and renowned for their Learning even among their Enemies. A Nobility, accomplished in the Arts of Peace and War, and possessed of all Endowments proper to adorn and strengthen their Country. A Magistracy, wise, learned and upright. In a Word, a whole Nation of such Esteem, that they are a Praise in the Earth.

No less considerable are they against whom our Author brings this heavy Charge. But how does he make it out? Why he *intends Brevity (l)*, and he is really so brief, that he brings no Arguments: *he designs his Discourse chiefly for ordinary Capacities (m)*, that is, the weaker Sort, who, to use his own Expression in another Place, *are no very good Judges of Consequences (n)*: and therefore he does not think fit to trouble them with Premises and Conclusions, but expects they should take every thing upon his Word.

(l) Page 1.
(m) Page 6.
(n) Page 9.

He asserts and premises (o), the very Things which are in Dispute, and defines particular Notice may be taken of his Assertions (p). Some modestly beg the Question, others so cunningly slide it in, that you can hardly perceive when they do it; so that they may properly be said to steal the Question. Our Author is above such mean Arts; he violently and openly seizes the Question, and bids you take Notice that he does it. And it is not for want of Will or Leisure that he brings no Proofs. For where Things are capable of being proved, and where no Body contends with him, he is full large in his Arguments (q). And is it not then astonishing, is it not sufficient to raise one's Indignation to the highest degree, that he should accuse us of want of Argument, when he calls so many honourable Persons Schismatics and Renegados, when he gives such odious and foul Names to so great a Nation, nay to

(o) Page 1. I shall say this in general, p. 4. These Things premised.

(p) Page 3.

(q) Witness his Proofs, that the Majority is not always in the Right; (p. 3.) that Those who Communicate with a Church, own its Authority, (p. 10, 11, 12;) that we ought not to condemn Positive Duties, (p. 14, 15;) that the Israelites sinn'd in sacrificing at Dan and Bethel, (p. 25.)

his

his own Country, without any Proof brought, and hardly any offered?

P. 3. "The Multitude or great Majority is often in the Wrong."

Answ. 'Tis true; and no one, I believe, ever deny'd it. And yet our Author can argue from the Majority, when he has it on his side (r), And on the other Hand, the Few or the Minority is not always in the right. Else *Atheists* and *Deists* would have a better Argument for their Errors, than they have yet been able to produce. And therefore I hope no one will be disposed to favour the Non-conforming *Nonjurors*, on account of the Smallness of their Number in Comparison of the Members of our Church.

But I would inform our Author, that tho' the Majority's being of a Side does not *always* prove, that they are in the right: yet the Majority's being of a side in Legislative and Judicial Matters, does often not only prove, but partly cause them to be in the right; and particularly in this Case of the Deprivation of the Nonjuring Bishops. I have shewn that

(r) For Instance, p. 21. "Some of the Orthodox did Communicate with the *Novatians* in *Constantinople*. But what were they to the Body of Christians elsewhere that did not?"

their

their being deprived by the Bishops in Parliament, was of the same Force as a Synodical Deprivation; therefore the Agreement not only of the Majority, but of all the Bishops present to deprive them, proves that Deprivation to be Valid. And I have also shewn, that the Supreme Civil Power has a Right to Deprive Bishops for State Crimes: therefore the Consent of the Majority of both Houses of Parliament to deprive the Nonjuring Bishops for disowning the Government, shews that they were rightly ejected on that Account too.

P. 3, 4. "The Promises, Graces, and
" Saving Blessings of Christ are appro-
" priated to his Body the Church, &c.
" The Authority of the Church of Eng-
" land, and consequently the Church of
" England it self was with the Deprived
" Bishops and Clergy, and remains still
" with their Successors, &c."

Ans. It is a common Artifice to blend together Truth and Falsehood, Things which none will deny, with Things which are disputed: that hasty and unwary Readers, when they perceive several Things asserted which they know to be true, may conclude, that all is of a Piece, and that those Assertions which they do not understand or doubt of, are
alike

alike true. That the *Saving Blessings of Christ* are appropriated to his Church, we assert as strongly as our Author can. We also own that the Church of England was (once) with the deprived Bishops and Clergy, as our Author oddly words it; or at least that they were with the Church of England: but to use his Expression in another Place (f), *We do not dispute with them what they were, but what they are:* and we have proved, that the Church does not remain with the Nonconforming Successors of the Deprived Bishops, because they have wilfully deserted her.

And since our Author seems plainly to intend, that his Readers should conclude that these Nonconformists are now Members of the Church of England, because we confess that they once were so: I shall take Leave to alter a Word or two in this Passage of his; and then desire to know how he approves of his own Reasoning. "The Authority of the Church of England, and consequently the Church of England it self, was with the Depriving Bishops and Clergy, and remains still with their Successors, who alone have immutably adhered to her true Constitution and Principles, and

“ are in all Points (their Sufferings of
 “ *Calumnies from their Adversaries* except-
 “ ed) the same now, as before these un-
 “ happy Differences arose ; when in the
 “ Confession of our Adversaries, the
 “ Church was with them, and those who
 “ communicated with them : And all that
 “ depart from them are at least in a State
 “ of Schism, and consequently in a more
 “ dangerous Condition than I am wil-
 “ ling to speak, lest I should be interpre-
 “ ted to upbraid them, rather than to
 “ caution them against the Hazard they
 “ run, whilst they continue at this dan-
 “ gerous Distance, and separate from the
 “ true Communion of the Church.”

Thus having taken for granted every
 thing which was to be proved, our Au-
 thor proceeds very gravely to propose and
 answer Objections : In answering every
 one of which, excepting the 6th, relating
 to *Abiathar*, he supposes that we are Schis-
 matics. But I have proved the contra-
 ry, and that the *Nonjurors*, by ground-
 lessly departing from us, are become Schis-
 maricks themselves ; and therefore what-
 soever he says of Weight upon all these
 Points, ought to be apply'd to himself
 and his Adherents.

His

His first Objection is, p. 4. That the *Laymen* are under such Ministers as were ordained by Canonical Bishops, &c. and his Answer is, p. 5. That these Bishops were indeed once Canonical, but that they not only thrust out the Lawful Bishops from their Sees, but placed others there, and thereby became Schismatics; and that the Parochial Clergy, by joining with these Schismatical Bishops, are become Schismatics too.

Reply. Here, according to his usual Custom, he supposes (what he ought to have proved) that our Bishops unjustly thrust out the Nonjuring Bishops from their Sees, and unjustly placed others in their room; for he could not represent our Bishops guilty of Schism for thrusting out the Nonjurors, without supposing they did it unjustly.

P. 5. "Erecting Altar against Altar, is the very formal Notion of Schism."

Reply. One would think that an Author, who designs his Discourse chiefly for ordinary Capacities (1), should have made the Nature of Schism very plain, when he was giving us the formal Notion of it: but I doubt ordinary Capacities will difficultly understand his Explanation, and therefore

(1) Vid. *Case of Schism*, p. 6.

I shall expound it to them. This Expression, which our Author delights so much in, *erecting Altar against Altar*, means the setting up one Bishop against another in the same Diocese. And if this be *the formal Notion of Schism*, our *Presbyterians* are no Schismatics: for they do not set up one Bishop against another, but equally disown all Bishops. It is indeed one sort of Schism: But I have proved that we are not guilty of it, because the Non-juring Bishops being Deprived, ceased to have any Dioceses.

P. 5. "They not only displaced the
" Canonical Metropolitan, Archbishop
" *Sancroft*, but hoisted up a Subject Pres-
" byter of his (Dr. *Tillotson*) into his
" Room, who had sworn Canonical
" Obedience to him."

Reply. Our Author seems to lay a Stress upon their displacing *an Archbishop and Metropolitan*. But if an Archbishop deserve to be deprived, there must be some Power in the Nation to deprive him. And surely the Bishops and the Supreme Civil Power have Authority to deprive him; if any Power can pretend to it. Dr. *Tillotson* had once been subject to Dr. *Sancroft*; but Dr. *Sancroft* being ejected by lawful Authority, as I say and have proved; or as they say, by unjust Force, which I have

have shewn to come to the same thing in this respect; Dr. *Sancroft* did thereupon cease to be Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and Dr. *Tillotson* was from thenceforth no more subject to him, nor any more bound to him by his Oath of Canonical Obedience, than to any Bishop in *Sweden*.

His second *Objection* is p. 7. that the Nonjuring Clergy want Authority to set up opposite Communion to the Parochial Clergy; and his Answer is, that the Nonjurors do not set up opposite Communion, but act under true Canonical Authority: and that we set up opposite Communion because we set up wrongful and uncanonical Bishops. So that in answer to this *Objection* as well as the former, he supposes without proving, that our Bishops are uncanonical.

His Third *Objection* relates to sinful Prayers in our Liturgy: whereby he means, I suppose, the Prayers for the the King and Royal Family, and the extraordinary Prayers appointed to be read during the late War with *France*, and afterward during the Rebellion. I have already discoursed at large upon this Point, but let us see how our Author handles it.

The Conforming *Nonjurors* plead for themselves, that by communicating with us in our Church-Service, they do not communicate in, nor give any Assent to these Prayers, because Assent to these Prayers is not required of them as a Term of Communion. To prove this, Mr. Dodwell brings this Argument among others, that the extraordinary Government Prayers are usually the Thoughts, not of the Majority even of the Church-Governours themselves, or of a Number sufficient to conclude the Absents by any Rules of Government (a), and therefore it does not appear that the Church does at all require assent to these Prayers, much less, that she requires assent to them as a Term of Communion. Now, nothing can be plainer, than that our Author should in Answer to this have said something to have proved, that the Church requires assent to these Prayers, as a Term of Communion. But he has done nothing toward it.

His first Answer is, p. 9. "What in this Objection is urg'd in behalf of Communion with the Antibishops and Parochial Clergy is, bad Prayers and

(a) *Further Prospect*, p. 74.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 499

“ want of Authority for them (that is,
 “ *want of Authority for the Prayers.*)
 “ A strange kind of Argument for Com-
 “ munion with them (that is, *our Bishops*
 “ *and Clergy*) for if they want Autho-
 “ rity, none ought to abet or countenance
 “ them.”

Reply. Here our Author presently changes the Subject he was speaking of, and having mentioned *the Prayers wanting Authority*, about which alone is the Dispute, in the next Words he speaks of *the Bishops and Clergy wanting Authority*, about which nothing is said or meant in this Objection. And he supposes, that the Conforming *Nonjurors* plead, that our Bishops and Clergy want Authority; whereas they assert that we have Authority.

He proceeds; “ But if they add sinful
 “ Terms of Communion, there is still
 “ farther Reason to avoid them: For
 “ joining with them is to own them and
 “ their Authority.”

Reply. Here, according to Custom, he takes the Matter in Controversy for granted: For the Question is, whether it be required of us, as a Term of Communion, that we should join in these Government Prayers? but he without offering any Proof, first supposes that it is a Term of

500 A TREATISE *against the*

Communion; and then shews, that to communicate with our Church, is to communicate with it on those Terms of Communion which she prescribes; which second is a Point no one disputes with him.

In his second *Answer* he laboriously proves the same Thing again, and also that to communicate with our Church, is to own its Authority, which is much the same Thing in other Words. In his third *Answer* (p. 11.) he brings Authorities to prove, that to join in the Church Service of any Religious Society, is to own the Authority of that Society; which no Body denies.

Thus our Author having talk'd of others using *Blinds* and *Disguises*, and *Fallacies*, and *Shifts*, and *Evasions*; and having rais'd a great Dust himself, but not offered one Word of Proof, he concludes very formally (p. 12.) *It is plain that those who will be with our Adversaries must answer for their Additionals.*

The 4th *Objection*, p. 12. is; "If a
" Servant be present when his Master
" swears, rails, or drinks himself drunk,
" these Sins of the Master do not make
" this Servant guilty, unless he himself
" approve of them; why then should
" the being present at wicked Prayers,
" make

“ make those guilty who declare against
“ them ?”

This is plainly an Objection of those
Nonjurors who conform and own the
Authority of our Bishops ; for they call
our Bishops *their Masters*, and themselves
the Servants of our Bishops ; and conse-
quently these Objectors do not believe
our Bishops to be Schismaticks.

Our Authors *Answer* is, p. 13. “ A
“ Servant is bound to wait on his wicked
“ Master ; but all Christians are command-
“ ed to avoid Schismaticks ;” and so on to
the same Purpose.

Reply. Here our Author again begs the
Question, and without Proof supposes our
Bishops to be Schismatical, and that the
Conforming *Nonjurors* own them to be
so ; whereas the contrary is manifest from
the Objection, as he himself has worded
it. Yet he concludes triumphantly, *that*
he has shewn the Absurdity of this Objection.
But I should be glad to be told, what
greater Absurdity there can be in an Au-
thor, than to be always supposing, and
never proving.

The 5th *Objection* is, p. 14. “ That Po-
“ sitive Duties are to give way to Natural :
“ Communion is a Natural Duty ; and
“ therefore when it cannot be otherwise
“ upheld, is to be kept with Schisma-
“ ticks.”

In drawing up this *Objection*, he supposes, what he should have proved, that our Church is Schismatical. Which Supposition being false, the *Objection* does not concern us; however, let us see how he has answered it.

His first *Answer* is, that *Christians* ought not to neglect, nor think lightly of *Positive Duties*. But this is no *Answer* to the *Objection*, which was, that we ought to prefer *Natural Duties* to *Positive*. For to prefer *Natural Duties* to *Positive*, is not, to despise or think lightly of *Positive Duties*, but only, not to think so highly of them as we do of *Natural*.

Then he proceeds, and largely proves, that we ought not to condemn *Positive Duties*; which every one will readily grant him. Only I shall beg Leave to clear up, what our Author writes in his second Particular, p. 15. where his Words imply, that *Natural Duties* are Duties upon some other Account, and that we ought to perform them for some other Reason, besides God's willing them; nay, that they would have been Duties if God had not willed them. For he makes *Positive Duties* to differ from *Natural*, because *Positives* had been no Duties, if God had not willed them. Whereas *Natural*, as well as *Positive Duties*, are Duties only because God has willed

will'd and appointed them. And the Difference between them is, that we know from Reason, that God has will'd and commanded *Natural Duties*; but we learn only from Revelation, that he has commanded *Positive Duties*. Indeed there are some *Natural Duties*, which we may perform for other Reasons, besides God's commanding them: as because they are agreeable to our Natural Appetites. And so we may have the like Reasons for performing *Positive Duties*, as for the sake of our Reputation. But there are many *Natural Duties*, which we perform for no other Reason, but that they are God's Will, as those *Natural Duties* which thwart our Natural Appetites.

In his second *Answer*, p. 16. he endeavours to prove, that *Sacrifice ought not to give Way to Works of Mercy*: upon which I immediately gave the Cause of *natural Duties* for lost. But in his third *Answer*, p. 17. he grants that in *special Cases Positives give way to Naturals*. If so, to what Purpose is all that he said before?

He proceeds, and makes a most nice and learned Distinction about Communion, asserting it to be *partly a Positive, and partly a Natural Duty*. Now I believe no one ever did pretend that Christian Communion was a Natural Duty,

and therefore one would think he invented this Objection, to get a Handle in answering it, to call us *Schismatics* over and over, and to insinuate that we have nothing to plead for our selves, but *Power and Possession*, and good *Success*, and that we are in *Opposition to God and his Church*, and by our *Wickedness* have *born down God's Ordinance* (w). Very heavy Charges indeed, which ought never to be advanc'd without very strong Proof, much less as they are here, without any Proof at all.

The sixth Objection is, "That *Abiathar* the *Jewish High-Priest* was deprived purely by a *Secular Power*, and another put in his Place by the same Power; and yet there follow'd no Schism in the Church of the *Jews*: why then should the like Fact cause a Schism in the Christian Church?"

And this Objection is the stronger, because the Power of the *Jewish High-Priest* proceeded directly from God as the Power of Bishops does; because a *Secular Prince* could not give this *Pontifical Power*, no more than he can *Episcopal*; and because our Church is of Opinion, that *Christian Princes* have the same Authority in

Religious Matters, as the *Jewish* Kings had (x); besides that the High-Priest's particular District was immediately appointed by God, which I have shewn a Bishop's Diocese not to be.

This being an Instance from Scripture, and being so clear a Proof of the Prince's Authority to deprive, our Author and the rest of our Adversaries, both *Papists* and Nonconforming *Nonjurors* have left no Stone unturn'd to evade it. But all their Evasions may be reduced to these Three Heads. Either they attempt to prove that *Abiathar* was not High-Priest, at least not rightfully so; or that *Solomon* did not deprive him of the High Priesthood; or that supposing *Solomon* to have deprived him of the High-Priesthood, we cannot from thence conclude, that Kings may deprive Bishops.

Now the Church of *England* has declared her Sense of this Case to be contrary to that of our Adversaries in every one of these Points. For I have before shewn (y), that in the Reign of King *James the First* she expressly asserted, "that *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar* from the High-

(x) Vid. Article 37. Canon 2.

(y) *Supra*, p. 152.

"Priest-

"Priesthood, and placed *Zadok* in his "room;" and I proved, that it was her Opinion, that Civil Governours in general had a like Power over Ecclesiastical Persons. But I shall severally consider these three Propositions.

1. Our Adversaries answer, that *Abiathar* was not High-Priest, at least not rightfully so.

And 1. Our Author maintains (2), that *Abiathar* was not a rightful High-Priest, but that *Zadok* had a better Right, because *Abiathar* was descended from *Ithamar* the Younger, and *Zadok* from *Eleazar* the the Elder Son of *Aaron*.

Reply. This Argument being urg'd also to shew, that *Abiathar* was not in Fact High-Priest, will be consider'd when I answer our other Adversaries. And it may be sufficient to reply here, that if he were a wrongful High-Priest: then according to the Principles of our Adversaries, the Jewish Church had been guilty of Schism in adhering to a wrongful High-Priest, in Opposition to one who had a better Right to that Office, and had never resigned it; for if he had resigned it, he could not have had it. And this Schism must have lasted all the Time of *David* and other inspired Men, who as well as the rest of the *Israelites*, acknow-

(2) Case of Schism, p. 21.

ledged

ledged *Abiathar*. Now it would be absurd to think, that if it had been Schismatical to adhere to *Abiathar*, these inspired Men should say nothing of this Schism; and much more absurd that they should all join in it.

But if *Zadok* had, as our Author asserts, the better Right; and yet these inspired Men acted lawfully in communicating with *Abiathar*, as they undoubtedly did: then it was not Schismatical to join with a High-Priest wrongfully constituted, in opposition to one who had a better Right. And this would justify our adhering to our Bishops, tho' they had been as manifestly wrongful, as I have shewn them to be rightful ones.

2. Others of our Adversaries maintain, that *Abiathar* was never in fact High-Priest.

Reply in general. This and several following Assertions of our Adversaries are such Paradoxes, that it will perhaps be thought a needless Labour to reply to them. And so it certainly is, with relation to the Generality of other Men, but not to our Adversaries, who having repeated these Assertions so often, one Writer after another, seem at length to think them indisputably true, because they are so manifestly false, that no one has hitherto thought they deserved to be confuted. As to this Point, that *Abiathar* was not in Fact High-Priest, several of the

“ of his Life in the Country, because he
 “ was not worthy to be any longer in
 “ Dignity : and that so, as God had fore-
 “ told to *Eli*, the *High Priesthood* was
 “ translated from the House of *Ithamar* to
 “ the Family of *Phinehas*, which had till
 “ then been only private Priests for se-
 “ veral Descents.”

Indeed, as Mr. *Dodwell* objects (c),
Josephus presently adds, “ That *Zadok* was
 “ the first High Priest of *Phinehas*’s Fami-
 “ mily after the abovementioned Inter-
 “ ruption, and that he was High-Priest
 “ in King *David*’s Time (d).” But we
 may well conclude, that *Josephus* did not
 really write so, and that this is a false
 Reading of (*David*) for (*Solomon*), because
 this is contrary to the Account immedi-
 ately preceding : and we can hardly sup-
 pose that *Josephus* would so soon forget
 and contradict himself. Yet if *Josephus*
 had said that *Zadok* was High Priest in
David’s Reign : yet since he also says, that
 he was the First High-Priest of his Fa-
 mily, and thereby implies, that *Eli* and
 his Descendants were High-Priests, he still
 contradicts our Adversaries in this very

(c) *Ubi supra*. p. 57.

(d) *Vid. supra*.

510 A TREATISE *against the*

Sentence. For they deny, that *Eli* or any of his Descendents were High-Priests; well knowing, that if they admit *them* to have been High-Priests, they have no Colour to deny *Abiathar* to have been one.

Josephus in another Place (e) confirms the abovementioned Passage, asserting directly, "that at first the Priesthood was " in *Eleazar's* Family; that afterward *Eli* " and his Descendents enjoyed it till the " Reign of *Solomon*; and that then it re- " turned to *Eleazar's* Posterity." Where by *Priesthood* it is manifest that he means the proper High-Priesthood.

And *Josephus* and the *Rabbies* had good Ground for this their Opinion. For when I reply to the particular Arguments of our Adversaries, I shall shew from Scripture, that the High-Priesthood was in *Ithamar's* Family from *Eli* to *Abiathar*; that in particular as to *Abiathar*, when he and *Zadok* are ranked according to their several *Aaronical* Offices, *Abiathar* seems to be put in the more honourable Place; and our Saviour himself expressly calls *Abiathar High-Priest*.

Our Adversaries argue, that *Abiathar* was not in *Fact* High-Priest, because

(e) *Archæologia*, L. 5. c. 12. Ηγες δ̄ πρῶτῳ Ἑλὶς Ἰθάρου τῷ ἱερεὶ ἢ Ἀαρὼν οἰκίας, ἢ ἡδ' Ἐλεάζρου οἰκία τὸ πρῶτον ἱερῶς, παῖς πατρὸς παρεδιχώρητο τὴν πρῶν. μετ' δὲ (Οζι) Ἑλὶς ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην καὶ τὸ γένῳ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μέχρι ἢ κατὰ τὴν Σολομῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ὥν τὸν δ̄ οἱ Ἐλεάζρου πάλιν αὐτὴν ἀπέλαβον. And a little before *Eli* is called Ἑλὶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς. that

that Office was Hereditary to the Eldest Sons; and because it was promised to *Phinehas's* Posterity, and in Fact only descended to them; and because *Zadok* was High-Priest even in King *David's* Reign.

1. They argue, that *Abiathar* was not High-Priest, because that Office was Hereditary to the eldest Sons.

Reply 1. Supposing this to be true, it will not make good the Cause of our Adversaries. For if it had been in its Institution so Hereditary; yet God might for the Sins of the elder Family, have removed it to the younger. And that he had done so, wou'd have been sufficiently proved by Scripture, which records, as I shall hereafter shew, that *Solomon's* Descendents were High-Priests for several Successions, and that the whole Church of God, and many inspired Men communicated with them. So God, when he gave the Ten Tribes to *Jeroboam*, promised him, that if he would keep his Statutes and Commandments, he would build him a sure House as he had built for *David*, 1 Kings xi. 38. And if the Scripture had been silent as to the Sins which *Jeroboam* and his Family afterward committed; yet when we found in History, that *Jeroboam's* Family was utterly destroyed: We might have justly concluded, that *Jeroboam* or his Family had forfeited God's Promise by their Iniquity. Re-

Reply 2. That the High-Priesthood was Hereditary, is too precarious to be made use of to prove another Point. For it is no where expressed or implied in Scripture. Where we find that God gave the Priesthood for ever to Aaron and his Sons; and that he made Aaron the first High-Priest (f). But as to his Successor in the High-Priesthood, it is only said; *The Holy Garments of Aaron shall be his Sons* (i. e. belong to his Sons) *after him to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them.* And (not his Eldest Son but) *THAT Son that is Priest in his stead, shall put them on* (g). *THAT Son that is Priest in his stead, or as it is in the Original, He who shall be Priest in his stead FROM among his Sons* (h). In the same manner it is said; *He from among the Sons of Aaron that offereth the Blood of the Peace Offerings and the Fat, shall have the right Shoulder for his Part* (i). And since it is agreed, that in this last Passage this Expression, *He from among the Sons of Aaron*, denotes indeterminate-ly *Any* of his Sons, it must be allow'd,

(f) Vid. *Exod.* xxviii. 1, 40, 41. xl. 15.

(g) *Exod.* xxix. 29, 30.

(h) הכהן תחתיו מבניו.

(i) מבני אהרן. *Levit.* vii. 33.

that

that in the former Passage it signifies the same. So it is said of Aaron's Successor in the High-Priesthood in the same indeterminate manner; *T H E P R I E S T* whom he shall anoint, and whom he shall consecrate to minister in the Priest's Office, in his Father's stead, shall make the Atonement (k). And the eldest Son is no where once mentioned. So that it was plainly left undetermined, which of Aaron's Sons should be High-Priest; only one or other of them was always to be so. And I cannot see, that the eldest Sons had a strict Right to that Office; any more than that the eldest Presbyter, being otherwise duly qualified, has a stronger Claim to be consecrated in the room of his deceased Bishop, than other Presbyters as well qualified.

Perhaps the High-Priesthood was at first for some time conferred by particular Divine Appointment; and it was certainly so conferred on Aaron and Eleazar (l), and our Adversaries collect the same as to Phinehas, from *Numb. xxv. 13*. And God's thus particularly interposing to appoint the elder Son, is an Argu-

(k) *Levit. xvi. 32.*

(l) *Vid. Exod. xxviii. 1. Numb. xx. 25.*

ment, that he had no Right by Birth and without God's Appointment. Thus, as to the Succession of the Kings, he only chose *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon*, who had no Right by Birth; but did not think fit to interpose afterward, when he intended, that the Kingdom should descend according to common Course.

It is the Opinion of Men skilled in the Jewish Learning, that the High-Priesthood was afterward Elective (m); and particularly *Maimonides* (n) says, that the *Sanhedrim*, when they possessed the Supreme Authority, chose the High-Priest. And it cannot well be thought, that the *Sanhedrim* would have exercised this Power unjustly, when they themselves, as well as the whole Nation, were so renacious of their Laws and Customs. Indeed the eldest Son seems to have been generally chosen High-Priest, probably to avoid Factions. And in the latter Times of the Jewish Government it is certain, that the *Macedonians* and *Romans* chose High-Priests, who must be confessed to have

(m) So *Grotius* frequently asserts, and *Bishop Kidder* also upon *Exod. xl. 15.* *Comp. Oleaster* on *Numb. xxv. 13.*

(n) Quoted by *Grotius*, on *Matt. xxvi. 3.*

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 515

been rightful Ones, as I have before shewn. And yet our Adversaries seem to take this their main Point for granted: except that the Enquirer brings one Argument, and Mr. Whiston mentions two others, but dares not lay any Stress upon either of them.

The Enquirer (o) says, "The High-Priesthood was settled upon Aaron, and his Eldest Sons after him in a direct Line, 1 Chron. vi. 49."

Reply. The Text it self will sufficiently confute this Argument. In the Words immediately foregoing it is observed, that the Levites were appointed unto all manner of Service of the Tabernacle of the House of God. And then it follows: But Aaron and his Sons offered upon the Altar of the Burnt-Offering, and on the Altar of Incense, and were appointed for all the Work of the Place most holy, and to make an Atonement for Israel, according to all that Moses the Servant of God had commanded. Where we do not find one Word of the High-Priesthood, or of Aaron's eldest Sons: but only that the Priesthood in general, as distinguished from the Office of the Levites, was settled upon Aaron and his Sons in general.

(o) Modest Enquiry into the Bishop of Bangor's Preservation, p. 9.

Mr. *Whiston* says (p), "The High-Priesthood seems to have been in Practice, generally at least, confined to the First-born Son of *Aaron's* Family; as God had set the Example in the Choice of *Aaron* the eldest Son of *Amram*; tho' I confess I do not observe any express Law for it; unless it were reckon'd one of the Rights of *Primogeniture*."

Reply. Mr. *Whiston* does fairly to confess, what is certainly true, that there is no express Law for it. And he is also much in the right not to lay any Stress on his two Arguments, but only to slide them in, and let them take their Chance. For as to the first of them, if the Example of God in choosing the eldest Son of *Amram*, be an Argument that *Primogeniture* gave a Right to the High Priesthood; then the Example of God in successively appointing *David* and *Solomon* to be Kings of *Israel*, will prove that the youngest Sons have a Right to Civil Rule; which no one has yet been so absurd to pretend. Besides, tho' *Aaron* was the eldest Son of *Amram*; yet *Amram* was the Son of *Kohath*, and *Kohath* was a younger Son of

(p) *Scripture Politicks*, p. 74.

Levi (q), and *Levi* was a younger Son of *Jacob* (r). So that God's Example in choosing *Aaron*, whose Grandfather and Great Grandfather were both younger Sons, does at least as strongly prove that the High-Priesthood belonged to the younger as to the elder Sons.

There is as little Force in the second Argument which Mr. *Whiston* insinuates, viz. That the High-Priesthood was reckoned one of the Rights of Primogeniture. The two first Brothers, *Cain* and *Abel*, both offered Sacrifice. And if the elder had had a strict Right to the Priesthood, we might have expected, that the younger for presuming to exercise that Office, would have undergone *Korah's* Fate. And yet we find, that the Lord had respect unto *Abel* and to his Offering (s). Some have fancied that *Adam* did on this Occasion perform the Office of Priest. But they might as well have said, *Eve*, for ought that appears in the History, which only relates that *Cain* and *Abel* offered their respective Offerings (t). And since, as I have shewn, *Aaron's*

(q) *Exod.* vi. 16, 18.

(r) *Genesis* xxix. 32, 33, 34.

(s) *Genesis* iv. 4.

(t) *Gen.* iv. 3, &c. *Heb.* xi. 4.

518 A TREATISE against the

Grandfather and Great Grandfather were both younger Sons, it is certain, that neither he nor his Sons could have any Right to be the only Priests, or High-Priests to the whole People of *Israel*, except by God's Donation. And therefore *there* alone are we to look for Proofs of the Preference of elder to younger Sons; but *there* none are to be found, as I have already observed.

It may perhaps be answered, that Priests were generally elder Sons.

Reply. It is true, that Kings were anciently High-Priests to their respective Nations, and Masters of Families were Priests to their own Households. And Kings and Masters of Families were often elder Sons. And when Masters of Families thought fit to transfer the Priesthood from themselves, it is not improbable but they might confer that honourable Office on their eldest Sons; because the elder has always been esteemed prior in Dignity to the younger Son, where they have been equal on other Accounts. Besides the elder any Person was, the fitter he was in that respect for such a venerable Office. And so eldest Sons might commonly in Fact be Priests. But this does not prove, that the First born had, as such, a strict Right to the Priesthood.

It

It is also answered by some, that "The
" *Levites* were taken into the Service of
" God instead of all the First-born among
" the Children of *Israel*.

Reply. This confirms, that the First-born had not any natural Right by their Primogeniture to the Priesthood. For God declares more than once; *On the Day that I smote all the First-born in the Land of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the First-born in Israel, both Man and Beast (u).* Which implies, that they were not sanctified before that Day; and that then they were sanctified, not on account of any natural Right; but because God had spared the First-born of *Israel*, when he slew the First-born of *Egypt*.

And this was not such a Sanctification neither as made them Priests. For both the Signification it self, and the Reason of it extended to Cattel as well as Men. And after the First-born were thus sanctified, God gave the Priesthood to *Aaron* and his Sons, and *Moses* consecrated and enstated them in their Office, without the least Intimation, that they were consecrated instead of the First-born, or that the Office of the First-born was

(u) *Numb.* iii. 13. viii. 17. *Comp. Exod.* xiii. 2, 15.

transferred to them. But on the contrary, the First-born continued sanctified as before, and the *Levites* were taken into the Service of God, and consecrated instead of the First-born some time after, and in a different Manner from the Consecration of *Aaron* and his Sons, and they were given instead of the First-born, not only to God, but also to *Aaron* and his Sons; which Circumstances plainly imply, that not *Aaron* and his Sons, but the *Levites* as distinguished from them, were taken into God's Service instead of the First-born.

The Gift must be different from the Persons to whom it is given. And God declares, *Numb. viii. 18, 19. I have taken the Levites for all the First-born of the Children of Israel. And I have given the Levites as a Gift to Aaron and to his Sons from among the Children of Israel.*

The Command to consecrate *Aaron* and his Sons to be Priests, and the actual Consecration of them was a considerable time, not only before the actual Consecration of the *Levites* to minister to the Tabernacle, but before God had commanded that they should be so consecrated, or made any Declaration that he intended it; as far as appears. For God commanded *Moses*, *Exod. xxviii* and *xxix.*

to take Aaron and his Sons, and consecrate them, that they might minister in the Priest's Office. And it is recorded, that they were actually consecrated, and entred upon their Sacerdotal Office, *Levit. viii* and *ix*. But the first Declaration we find of God's Will that the *Levites* should be separated to his Service was, when God commanded *Moses* to number the rest of the Congregation, but not to number the *Levites* with them, because they were to be appointed over the Tabernacle, *Numb. i. 49, 50*. Only thou shalt not number the Tribe of Levi, neither take the Sum of them among the Children of Israel. But thou shalt appoint the *Levites* over the Tabernacle of Testimony, which implies that they were not appointed before. The same Declaration in effect is repeated afterward, *Numb. iii. 6, 12*. After all this, God says to *Moses*, *Numb. viii. 6*. Take the *Levites* from among the Children of Israel, and cleanse them: and then he proceeds to direct in what manner they should be cleansed and offered, that they might execute the Service of the Lord. And afterward, *Ver. 20, 21, 22*. it is related that they were actually cleansed and offered accordingly, and then entred upon their Service.

And

And as the *Levites* were given after the Consecration of *Aaron* and his Sons, and were given to *Aaron* and his Sons: so they were consecrated in a manner remarkably different from the Consecration of *Aaron* and his Sons. For when the *Levites* were presented to God, the *Children of Israel* put their Hands upon them, to denote that they offered them to God instead of their First-born; and *Aaron* offered them before the Lord for an Offering of the *Children of Israel* (w). But this Ceremony was not used, when *Aaron* and his Sons were consecrated; nor are they ever stiled an Offering of the *Children of Israel*, but are only said to have been taken and called by God Himself from among the *Children of Israel* (x). All which argues, that they were not taken into the Service of God instead of the First-born, and consequently that the Rights and Office of the First-born, even after God had sanctified them, were different from the Sacerdotal.

The second Argument of our Adversaries, that *Abiathar* was not High-Priest, is, "Because for *Phinehas's* Faithfulness in

(w) *Numb.* viii. 10, 11.

(x) *Exod.* xxviii. 1. *xxix.* 44. *Heb.* v. 4.

" execut-

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 523

"executing Vengeance on *Zimri* and
" *Cosbi*, God promised the *High-Priest-*
" *hood to him and his Seed after him, even*
" *the Covenant of an everlasting Priesthood,*
" *Numb. xxv. 7—13. (1).*

Reply. These last Words are printed by Mr. *Whiston* in the *Italick Character*, as if they were the Words of Scripture; yet the Text quoted by him does not say, that God promised to *Phinehas* the *High-Priesthood*, but the *Priesthood*. And therefore our Adversaries, who argue that *Abiathar* was not *High-Priest*, because he is never called so, cannot, if they will be consistent with themselves, collect any more from this Text, than that God would preserve the Male Line of *Phinehas* in the *Priesthood*, and neither suffer his Family to fail, nor to be removed from being Priests; as those seem to have been, who could not find their Genealogy in *Nehemiah's* Time (2).

Reply 2. Supposing that to have been a Promise of the *High-Priesthood*, it was conditional, as most other Promises were, and only meant, that the *High-Priesthood* should be continued in *Phinehas's*

(1) *Mr. Whiston, p. 71. Mr. Dodwell, p. 56.*

(2) *Id. Nehemiah vii. 64.*

Posterity,

Posterity, so long as they imitated his Piety, as even some Papists have owned (a). And therefore since Phinehas's Posterity were, as I shall shortly shew, rejected from the High-Priesthood for a Time, we may conclude, that they had forfeited that Promise by their Wickedness, which their Ancestor had obtained by his Zeal.

The third Argument of our Adversaries is, "That the High-Priesthood was in fact derived down upon the eldest Sons of Aaron in a direct Line, from the Days of Moses till the Days of Darius II. King of Persia." And this is attempted to be proved by several Arguments, positive and negative.

"1. One positive Proof is from that Catalogue of High-Priests, recorded 1 Chron. vi. to Jer. 13. (b).

Reply. This Argument does not deserve any Reply, since it was incumbent on our Adversaries, to have shewn that this is a Catalogue of High-Priests, and not barely to have asserted it. However,

(a) Dionys. Carthus, quoted by Cornelius à Lapide, and Tirinus.

(b) Enquiry, &c. p. 9. Mr. Whiston, p. 72. Mr. Collier in Abiathar, in the last Volume of his Dictionary.

for their Satisfaction, I will evince that this is not a Catalogue of High-Priests, tho' some High-Priests are therein recorded. And to make out this, I will produce the whole Passage.

The Sons of Levi: Gershon, Kohath, and Merari. And the Sons of Kohath, Amram, Izhar, and Hebron, and Uzziel. And the Children of Amram: Aaron, and Moses, and Miriam. The Sons also of Aaron: Nadab, and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Eleazar begat Phinehas, Phinehas begat Abisbua, and Abisbua begat Bukki, and Bukki begat Uzzi, and Uzzi begat Zerabiah, and Zerabiah begat Meraioth, Meraioth begat Amariah, and Amariah begat Abitub. And Abitub begat Zadok, and Zadok begat Ahimaaz, and Ahimaaz begat Azariah, and Azariah begat Johanan, and Johanan begat Azariah (he it is that executed the Priest's Office in the Temple that Solomon built in Jerusalem). And Azariah begat Amariah, and Amariah begat Abitub, and Abitub begat Zadok, and Zadok begat Shallum, and Shallum begat Hilkiab, and Hilkiab begat Azariah. And Azariah begat Seraiah, and Seraiah begat Jehozadak. And Jehozadak went into Captivity, when the Lord carried away Judah and Jerusalem by the Hand of Nebuchadnezzar.

Now

Now what can our Adversaries collect from this Passage? Does the Scripture call it a Catalogue of the High-Priests? No such Matter. Are the Persons in this Catalogue styled High-Priests? Not one of them. The most that is said, and that is only said of one of them, *viz. Azariah*, is, *that he executed the Priest's Office*; not the *High-Priest's*, as the Enquirer misrepresents.

Does this Catalogue Register all the High-Priests, and *none else*? Neither the one nor the other. The Persons named from *Levi* to *Aaron*, do not appear to have been so much as Priests. The Enquirer indeed, without any apparent Reason for it, except that it best serves his Turn, begins the Catalogue from *Aaron*, not from *Levi*. And should we gratify him so far as to reckon in the same manner: Yet still *Nadab*, *Abihu*, and *Ithamar* will be found in the Catalogue, none of whom were High-Priests. And it will appear, that others also in this Catalogue were not High-Priests, when I shall prove that *Eli* and his Descendants were so. And besides, as *Nadab* and *Abihu* certainly did die before their Father; so it is *probable* that some more of the Persons here recorded might have the like Fate in a Succession of eight or nine Hundred Years.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 527

Years. And if any one of them had, he could never have been High-Priest according to the Principles of our Adversaries.

Several also who were certainly High-Priests, and very considerable in that Office, are here omitted besides the Descendants of *Ithamar* from *Eli* to *Abiathar*. *Hilkiah* was High-Priest in *Josiah's* Reign (c). *Amariah* was the Chief-Priest in *Jehoshaphat's* Reign (d). This must be the second *Amariah* in this Catalogue, not the first who was Grandfather to *Zadok*, *Abiathar's* Contemporary. Between *Hilkiah* and this second *Amariah*, we find mention of *Azariah the Chief Priest*, who signalized himself in Defence of the Sacerdotal Rights, when they were invaded by King *Uzziah* (e). And we also find mention of *Azariah the Chief Priest of the House of Zadok* in the Reign of *Hezekiah* (f). These were possibly two *Azariah's*, one in *Uzziah's* Reign, and the other in *Hezekiah's*. Yet supposing them to be but one; here is at least one *Azariah* a High-Priest of Note, between *Hilkiah* and the second *Amariah*. But there is no *Azariah* to be found between those two Persons in the Catalogue

(c) 2 Kings xxii. 8. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9.

(d) 2 Chron. xix. 11.

(e) 2 Chron. xxvi. 17, 18, 20.

(f) 2 Chron. xxxi. 10, 13.

before

before us, nor in that other Catalogue produced by our Adversaries out of *Exra* vii. which we are to consider by and by.

Jehoiada, who was High-Priest in King *Joash's* Reign, and appears to have been the most considerable High-Priest after *Zadok*, is not in this Catalogue. Some imagine that *Johanan* here mentioned, is the same with *Jehoiada*, probably because there is some small Resemblance in the Names. But this is a palpable Mistake, and *Johanan* was probably dead long before *Jehoiada* was born. For *Johanan* was Grandfather to that *Amariah* who was High-Priest in *Jehoshaphat's* Reign. And *Jehoiada* was High-Priest in the Reign of *Joash*, *Jehoshaphat's* Great Grandson.

Mr. *Whiston* (g) endeavours to cut the Knot, by denying *Jehoiada* to have been really High-Priest, tho' he allows, that he is generally supposed to have been so. The Reason he gives is, "That he finds no
" SIGN, that *Jehoiada* was the real High-
" Priest, but only that he was a Priest of
" great Power and Dignity on account
" of his Affinity with the Royal Fa-
" mily.

(g) *Scripture Politicks*, p. 72, 73, 74. 103.

Reply.

Reply. Jehoiada put the Crown upon King Jehoash, and gave him the Testimony, and he and his Sons anointed him (b), he made a Covenant between God, and the King, and the People (i), he commanded the Priests, and governed their Courses, and appointed Officers over the House of the Lord, and appointed the Offices of the House of the Lord, Sacerdotal as well as Levitical (k), he had the supreme Command also over sacred Things, so as to deliver out to the Captains King David's Arms, which had been dedicated to God (l); and lastly, he is often called the Priest, and once particularly the Priest in the Singular Number, by Way of Distinction from the Priests in the Plural Number; Jehoiada called for Jehoiada the Priest and the Priests (m). One would think that these might pass for Signs, that Jehoiada was a real and proper High-Priest.

But to put this Matter past all doubt, The Chief Priest, or as it is in the Hebrew, The Priest the Head (n), is a Title pe-

(b) 2 Kings xi. 12. 2 Chron. xxiii. 11.

(i) 2 Kings xi. 17. 2 Chron. xxiii. 16.

(k) 2 Chron. xxiii. 8, 18. 2 Kings xi. 18.

(l) 2 Chron. xxiii. 9.

(m) 2 Kings xii. 7. It is indeed in our Translation the Priest and the OTHER Priests. But the Word *Osher* is not in the Original.

(n) *והיה הכהן*

culiar to the proper High Priest, and is given to Aaron himself, Ezra vii. 5. And this Title is given to Jehoiada, 2 Chron. xxiv. 5, 6. Joash gathered together the Priests and the Levites — And the King called for Jehoiada the Chief, Heb. the H E A D. Which is thus expressed 2 Kings xii. 7. King Jehoash called for Jehoiada the Priest and the Priests, as I have before observed. So that there can be no doubt but that by the Head is here meant the Head Priest.

And afterward in the 11th Verse of this xxivth Chapter Jehoiada is expressly called The Priest the Head. When they saw that there was much Money in the Chest, the King's Scribe, and the High Priest's Officer, Heb. The Officer of the PRIEST THE HEAD, came and emptied the Chest. And in the next Verse it follows; And the King and Jehoiada gave (the Money) to such as did the Work. From whence it is manifest that by the Priest the Head in the former Verse, is meant Jehoiada. Because he who in conjunction with the King was a Principal, in disposing of the Money, was unquestionably a Principal also in receiving it. The King's Scribe received the Money, in the King's Name and by his Authority; and then delivered it to the King his Principal, The Head

Head Priest's Officer delivered the Money to Jehoiada. Therefore Jehoiada was the Head Priest, in whose Name, and by whose Authority that Officer received it. Besides, I have just shewn, that Jehoiada the Priest is called the Head a little before in this very Passage.

The High or Great Priest is also a Title peculiar to him who was the proper High Priest (a). And this Title is given to Jehoiada, as appears from 2 Kings xii. 7, &c. King Jehoash called for Jehoiada the Priest and the Priests, and said unto them, why repair ye not the Breaches of the House (of the Lord)? — Jehoiada the Priest took a Chest and set it beside the Altar, and the Priests that kept the Door, put therein all the Money that was brought into the House of the Lord. And it was so, when they saw that there was much Money in the Chest, that the King's Scribe and the High Priest, Heb. the GREAT PRIEST, came up, and they told the Money. And they gave it into the Hands of them that did the Work.

It is plain enough from this Passage considered by it self, that the Person here entitled the Great Priest was Jehoiada, be-

(a) Vid. Levit. xxi. 10. Numb. xxxv. 25, 28.

cause he is named as the principal Priest in this Affair, and no other Priest was so considerable to be mentioned by Name. He appears to have been supreme in placing the Chest to receive the Money, and therefore he undoubtedly was the Great Priest, who when the Money was received, took an Account and disposed of it.

But this will appear certain, if we compare this Passage with the other parallel Passage already quoted out of *Chronicles*. For the Words, *The King's Scribe and the Great Priest came up*, may, and I presume should be translated, *The Scribe of the King, and the Scribe of the Great Priest came up* (p). And so this exactly agrees with that Passage in *Chronicles*. *The King's Scribe and the Head Priest's Officer came and emptied the Chest. And the King and Jehoiada gave the Money to such as did the Work. He then who is stiled the Head Priest in Chronicles, was manifestly the same Person with him, who is called the Great Priest in Kings, and I have before shewn, that by the Head Priest in that Passage, was meant Jehoiada.*

(p) ויעל ספר המלך והכהן הגדול

Since then this is neither called a Catalogue of High-Priests, nor are the Persons therein registered, stiled High-Priests, and some of them were not High-Priests, and some who were High-Priests and very considerable in that Station are omitted; how came our Adversaries to imagine this to be a Catalogue of High-Priests? I suppose, because they knew from other Passages of Scripture, that some of these Persons were High-Priests. But they might as well have concluded, that all those recorded in *Saul's* Genealogy, 1 *Chron.* ix. 39. were Kings, because *Saul* was so, or that all the Persons in the Genealogy in the Third Chapter of *St. Luke*, were Sons of God in an extraordinary Manner, because the first and last were so.

But perhaps it will be asked, If this be not a Catalogue of High-Priests, to what Purpose is it here inserted?

Reply. All that is certain is, that the inspired Writer having in the foregoing Chapters given the Genealogies of the Tribes of *Juda*, *Simon* and *Reuben*, proceeds to insert those of the Tribe of *Levi*, beginning with the Family of *Aaron* and *Eleazar*. So in other Places he records the Genealogies of *Caleb*, *Saul* M m 3 (q), and

(q), and other great Men. And will our Adversaries conclude, that all the Persons in this Genealogy were, and that *Eli* and *Ahiathar* were not High-Priests, barely because the Scripture does not mention any of *Ithamar's* Descendents in *Eleazar's* Pedigree?

And farther, since the *Chronicles* were written after the Captivity, and this Genealogy is closed with *Jehozadak* who went into Captivity, and whose Descendents, *Josbua*, *Joiakim*, and *Eliashib* were High-Priests after the Captivity (r), it is probable, that one principal End of the Historian in writing this Genealogy, was to shew that *Jehozadak* and the High-Priests, his Descendents, were regularly sprung from *Aaron*: which was then much more material to be known, than the Genealogy of *Eli's* Descendents, who were in all likelihood decayed and sunk, and Priests of the meanest Rank, according to the Prophecy concerning him. However, if I should alledge a wrong Cause of the Historian's recording this Genealogy; it will not follow, that our Adversaries have assigned a true one.

(q) 1 *Chron.* ii. 18. ix. 39.

(r) Vid. *Ezra* iii. 2. *Nehemiah* iii. 1. xii. 10, 22, 23; 16. *Haggai* i. 1. *Zech.* iii. 1.

2. The other positive Proof of our Adversaries, that the High-Priesthood was in Fact derived down upon the eldest Sons of Aaron, is *Ezra vii. 1—6. (f)*.

Reply. Our Adversaries have been so wise not to produce this Passage at length neither, but I will do it for them. Now after these Things, in the Reign of Artaxerxes King of Persia, Ezra the Son of Seraiah, the Son of Azariah, the Son of Hithiah, The Son of Shaltum, the Son of Zadok, the Son of Ahitub, The Son of Amariah, the Son of Azariah, the Son of Meraioth, The Son of Zerachiah, the Son of Uzzi, the Son of Bukki, The Son of Abishua, the Son of Phinehas, the Son of Eleazar, the Son of Aaron the Chief Priest: This Ezra went up from Babylon.

I will readily confess that our Adversaries had as much, nay more Reason to understand this to be a Catalogue of High-Priests, than the former Genealogy. For in this Aaron the Head of the Family is called the Chief Priest: which Title is not once mentioned in the former Pedigree. And yet it is certain, that this is not a Catalogue of High-Priests. Because Ezra himself, the last in this Ge-

(f) Mr. Collier in Abiathar in the last Volume of his Dictionary. Mr. Whiston's Scripture Politicks, p. 72.

nealogy, and for whose sake it appears to have been written, was not High-Priest. For, as I before observed, *Josbua*, *Joiakim*, and *Eliashib*, Descendents of *Jehozadak* were successively High-Priests in the Time of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (r). Since then this was not a Catalogue of High-Priests, we have more reason to conclude that the former was not so.

Our Adversaries also endeavour to prove, that neither *Eli* nor any of his Descendents were High-Priests, and consequently that the High-Priesthood was in Fact derived down upon *Aaron's* eldest Sons, by these negative Arguments, viz. that the Scripture never calls them High-Priests, nor mentions their Enquiry by *Urim*, nor any other Act of theirs which was peculiar to the High-Priests, nor does it record that *Eleazar's* Family was excluded, and *Eli* appointed in their room.

1. That the Scripture never calls *Eli* or his Descendents High-Priests (s).

Reply. Are the pretended High-Priests, *Zerabiah*, *Meraioth*, &c. so called? No. Is *Zadok* himself so called? Not once that I can find; and Mr. *Dodwell* confesses (u),

(s) Mr. *Dodwell's* Defence of Vindic. p. 54. Mr. *Whiston*, p. 73.

(u) Ibid.

“ that there is no High-Priest mention-
 “ ed in the Interval from *Phinehas* to
 “ *Abiathar*, but *Eli*, *Ahias*, and *Ahi-*
 “ *melech*, all of the Race of *Ishamar*.”

And therefore, according to the Reason-
 ing of our Adversaries themselves, none
 of *Phinehas*'s Posterity was High-Priest
 before *Zadok*. The Truth is, tho' *Moses*
 sometimes uses that Title when he is
 speaking of the High-Priest's Office (w):
 yet till after *Solomon*'s Time, it was sel-
 dom or ever given to any particular Per-
 sons by Name. But *Aaron*, *Eleazar*, *Phi-*
nehas, and others confessedly High-Priests,
 are respectively intitled *the Priest* by way
 of Eminence. And so are *Eli* and his De-
 scendents stiled (x) as well as they.

Yet tho' none of *Eleazar*'s Descendents
 from *Phinehas* to *Zadok* had ever the Title
 of High-Priest given them, either in the
 Old or New Testament; I shall hereafter
 shew, that probably by *Aaron the Father*
of the Priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 19. is meant
Abiathar; and he could not be called by
 that Name for any other Reason, but
 because he was *Aaron*'s Successor in the
 High-Priesthood. And our Saviour him-

(w) *Levit.* xxi. 10. *Numb.* xxxv. 25, 28.

(x) 1 *Sam.* xiv. 3. *xxi.* 1, &c.

dents till *Zadok*, our Adversaries must either contradict themselves, or grant that *Abiathar* was High-Priest, and that none of *Phinehas's* Descendents were so before *Zadok*.

2. Another Negative Argument brought by Mr. *Whiston* (2) is, that the Scripture never mentions *Eli's Enquiry by Urim*.

Reply 1. The Scripture no where mentions, that any of *Eleazar's* Descendents, from *Phinehas* to *Zadok* enquired by *Urim*, and consequently by Mr. *Whiston's* own Argument, none of them were High-Priests.

2. If the Scripture mention that any of *Eli's* Descendents enquired by *Urim*, it is the same thing as to our present Question, as if *Eli* himself had done it. Now *Ahia* was *Eli's* Grandson (4). And when *Saul* heard the Tumult caused in the Camp of the *Philistines* by *Jonathan* and his Armour-Bearer, He said unto *Ahia*, Bring hither the Ark of God. And it came to pass while *Saul* talked unto the Priest, that the Noise that was in the Host of the *Philistines* went on and increased. And *Saul* said unto the Priest, with raw thine Hand.

(2) Pag. 73.

(4) Vid. 1 Sam. xiv. 3.

And after the Battle was over, Saul asked Counsel of God, Shall I go down after the Philistines? Wilt thou deliver them into the Hand of Israel? But he answered him not that Day (b). All which plainly implies, that Abia used to enquire of God by Urim.

Does the Edomite accused Abimelech of enquiring of the Lord for David; and for that Reason among others, Saul put Abimelech to Death (c). Hence we may collect, that Abimelech did actually do so; or at least that he was High-Priest, and had Authority to do so: else the Accusation would have been senseless, and would have confuted it self.

Lastly, It is so particularly related, how Abiathar enquired of the Lord for David when he was in Keilah and Ziklag (d), that it is from those Passages we have the exactest Account of any of the manner of enquiring by Urim and Thummim. And in short, Mr. Dodwell owns (e), that Abimelech and Abiathar gave Divine Answers to David; and Dr. Lightfoot (f) has ob-

(b) Ver. 18. 19, 37.

(c) 1 Sam. xxii. 10, 13, 15, 16.

(d) 1 Sam. xxiii. 6, 9---12. xxx. 7.

(e) Defence of Vindici. p. 54.

(f) Upon Mark ii. 26.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 541

served after the *Rabbies*, "that under *A-*
" himelch and *Abiathar*, the mention of
" enquiring by Urim and Thummim is
" more frequent than it is ever any where
" else, and there is scarcely mention of it
" at all after Abiathar." So that this
 Argument of Mr. *Whiston* does must fully
 prove, that *Phinehas's* Descendents were
 not, and that *Eli's* Descendents were
 High-Priests in the strictest Sense of the
 Word.

Mr. *Dodwell* was so sensible of this, that
 to avoid the Force of it, he asks (g),
 " How do they know, that this Office
 " of giving Responses by *Urim*, was so
 " the Prerogative of the first High-Priest,
 " that it might not in his Absence agree
 " to the lower High-Priest of the *Junior*
 " Family? Why might not the two Fa-
 " milies take their Turns for their mu-
 " tual Ease in these Offices of attending
 " the King? And why might not these
 " Times fall on the Courses of *Ithamar*?

Reply 1. Supposing that in the Absence
 of the High-Priest, others could give Re-
 sponses by *Urim*: yet it will hardly be
 believed without Proof, that Deputies
 should execute a most sacred Part of

the High-Priest's Office so often, and so long as during the three Successions of *Abia*, *Abimelech* and *Abiathar*, i. e. near 80 Years, and that it should never fall out all this while, that the pretended Principals of *Eleazar's* Line should be once mentioned to have discharged this or any other Part of the High-Priest's Office.

Reply 2. The *Urim* and *Thummim* were in the Pontifical Vestments (b), and there are very strong Arguments, that only the proper High-Priest could wear those Vestments, and consequently that only he could give Responses by *Urim*. And I know of no Arguments of any Weight to the contrary.

The principal Passages in Scripture relating to the Person who was to wear the *Holy Garments* of Aaron, are those which follow, *Exod. xxix. 29.* The *Holy Garments* of Aaron shall be his Sons after him to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them. And that Son that is Priest in his stead, shall put them on seven Days, when he cometh into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to minister in the Holy

(b) *Exod. xxviii. 30.*

Place, Levit. xvi. 32. The Priest whom he shall anoint, and whom he shall consecrate to minister in the Priest's Office in his Father's stead, shall make the Atonement (for the Children of Israel), and shall put on the Linen Clothes, even the Holy Garments, Levit. xxi. 10. He that is the High Priest among his Brethren, upon whose Head the anointing Oil was poured, and that is consecrated to put on the Garments, shall not uncover his Head, nor rent his Clothes. And in Pursuance of these Rules, when Eleazar was to succeed Aaron in the proper High Priesthood, God commanded Moses, Strip Aaron of his Garments, and put them upon Eleazar his Son; and Moses did accordingly, Numb. xx. 26, 28.

Here we see it is particularly commanded, that the proper High Priest should wear the Pontifical Vestments. But it is no where expressed or implied, that a Deputy might wear them. It is ordered, that the Holy Garments of Aaron should belong to his Son AFTER him, not WITH him. And it is implied, that no one could wear them, but he who was anointed and consecrated to put them on; and that even he who should be the proper High Priest in his Father's stead, should not come into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to minister in the holy Place, those

those Ministrations which were appropriated to the High-Priest, nor consequently to wear the Vestments in which those Ministrations were to be performed, till he should be *anointed and consecrated in them seven Days*. And I shall hereafter observe, that after the first Anointment and Consecration of *Aaron* and his Sons, the inferior Priests were not anointed or consecrated, but only the proper High-Priest. *Moses* translated the High-Priesthood from *Aaron* to *Eleazar*, by stripping *Aaron* of his Pontifical Garments, and putting them upon *Eleazar*. Now this would not have been a certain Sign that *Eleazar* was constituted High-Priest, if those who were not proper High-Priests had used to wear those Garments. And it is a part of the Description of the High-Priest, that he was *consecrated to put on the Pontifical Garments*. Now how would this have distinguished the proper High-Priest from his pretended Deputies if they had been consecrated to wear those Garments as well as he?

1. Mr. Dodwell answers, *Exod. xxviii. 4. They shall make Holy Garments for Aaron thy Brother, and his Sons, that he may minister unto me in the Priest's Office.*

Reply. Either this means that the sacred Vestments in general, both those
com-

common to the Priests, and those appropriated to the High-Priest, were to be made the one for Aaron, and the other for his Sons; that he, i. e. by a common Hebrew Phrase, that every one of them, may minister in his respective Sacerdotal Office. So David says, Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve him. Him, i. e. every one of them (i). And then this Passage agrees with the latter Part of this Chapter, Ver. 40, 41. And for Aaron's Sons thou shalt make Coats — And thou shalt put them upon Aaron thy Brother, and his Sons with him — that they may minister unto me in the Priest's Office (k).

Or else by the Holy Garments are only meant the Vestments proper to the High-Priest. And then the Sense is, that the Pontifical Garments were to be made for Aaron, and for those Sons of his, who should succeed him in the High-Priesthood, that he might minister in the High-Priest's Office, and they severally after him. Just as it is said, Chap. xxix. 29, 30. The Holy Garments of Aaron shall be his Sons, (i. e. shall belong to his Sons in the Plural Number) after him (l), to be anointed

(i) Vid. Margin of our Bible, on Psal. xii. 7.

(k) Comp. Exod. xxxi. 10: xxx. 30.

(l) יהיו לכניו אחריו

therein, and to be consecrated in them. And, (not his Sons in general, but only) that Son that is Priest in his stead shall put them on —

Now in which soever of these Senses these Words be understood, no one can conclude from them, that inferior Priests might be deputed to wear the Holy Garments appropriated to the High-Priest.

2. Mr. Dodwel answers, "That the High-Priesthood, as to the Execution of it, was common to Aaron and his Sons, and therefore the (Pontifical) Vestments were so too, only with Dependence on him (m)," i. e. in other Words, there was no more difference of Order between the proper High-Priest, and the inferior Priests, than there is between Archbishops and Bishops. This Mr. Dodwel endeavours to prove by several Arguments.

1. "Aaron is hardly ever mentioned without his Sons, as joint Sharers with him in the High-Priesthood. The first Command was (n) that Aaron and his Sons should be taken from among the

(m) Mr. Dodwel, *ubi supra*, p. 55. *Comp. Case of Schism*, p. 20.

(n) *Exod.* xxviii. 1.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 547

"Children of Israel, that He might minister in the Priest's Office."

Reply. Aaron's Sons are often mentioned as Sharers with him in the *Priesthood*; for so they were: Never as Sharers with him in the *High-Priesthood*, no not in this very Passage, which is the only one Mr. Dodwel brings. On the contrary I have shewn, that the Inferior Priests were not Sharers with the proper High-Priest in wearing the Pontifical Garments, nor consequently in executing those Offices, which could only be performed in those Garments. None also but the proper High-Priest could enter into the Holy of Holys, and perform that great Annual Expiation for all the Priests and People (o); in which respect he was a Type of Christ. And we are often told expressly, what lower Offices the inferior Priests might discharge as well as the High-Priest (p). But it would not have been necessary to have been particular, if they might have been appointed to discharge every sacred Office.

(o) *Heb. ix. 6, 7. Exod. xxx. 10. Levit. xvi. 2, 3.*

(p) *Levit. vi. 9, 14. xiii. 2.*

2. " *Aaron* and his Sons were consecrat-
 " ed together, and by one common Form,
 " which seems plainly to imply, that the
 " Power communicated by that Form
 " was common also, only reserving the
 " Rights of the Prerogative (q).

Reply. This is manifestly false, if *Conse-
 cration* be taken as Mr. *Dodwel* seems to
 take it, in the largest Sense, viz. as it
 comprehends all the sacred Ceremonies
 performed when they were consecrated.
 For it is agreed that the Pontifical Vest-
 ments were put upon *Aaron*, and not up-
 on his Sons. And I shall shortly shew,
 that their *Uction* was not the same.

If *Consecration* mean strictly the dedi-
 cating and presenting them to God, their
Consecration was the same. For they
 were all presented to the same Being, viz.
 God; and they were all wholly, and conse-
 quently equally dedicated to him. But then
 this *Consecration* signify'd what was gi-
 ven to God, not what Power or Sacerdo-
 tal Grace God gave to them; and conse-
 quently it did not imply, that their Pow-
 er was common or different.

3. " Their Washings were the same.
 " The Offerings were also common among
 " them, both those which were to be
 " shared by them, and those which were
 " to be offered for them (q). *Reply.*

(q) Mr. *Dodwell*, *ubi supra*.

Reply. So the Baptism of Christians is the same. The same Christ was offered for them all. The same Lord's-Supper is shared by them. Yet some of them are Laymen, others Deacons, Presbyters or Bishops.

4. "The Form of Blessing the People prescribed to *Aaron* and his Sons, is exactly the same. And from this Power of Blessing, the Apostle Reasons (r), in judging of the Greatness and Excellency of Priesthoods.

Reply. The Apostle does not compare the Forms of Blessing, but the Person who bestows the Blessing, with him who receives it. The Form may be the same, and yet the Authority of the Persons who pronounce it, and the Blessings convey'd by it may be different. It is probable that our Saviour blessed in the same Form as others did. Yet no one can from thence conclude, that his Authority was no greater nor his Blessing more effectual than that of others. And supposing the Authority of *Aaron* and his Sons to have been the same in respect of Blessing, it by no means therefore follows, that it was the same in all other Respects. *Lastly,*

(r) *Heb.* vii. 6, 7.

Both Presbyters and Bishops bless now in the same Form, and yet it is agreed, that their Orders are different.

5. "The *Levites* were given in common to *Aaron* and his Sons (f).

Reply. So Deacons minister to Presbyters as well as to Bishops.

6. "The *Unction* of *Aaron* and his Sons was the same, and that was the Principal Rite of Consecration, which entitled them to all the Right which they could pretend to as the Lord's anointed (f).

Reply. If their *Unction* entitled them to all their Sacerdotal Right, the other Ceremonies used at their Consecration could not entitle them to any : and consequently several of Mr. *Dodwel's* former Arguments are confessedly of no Force, because there is no arguing that the Sacerdotal Right of *Aaron* and his Sons was the same, from the Use of Ceremonies, which did not confer Sacerdotal Right. And *this* Argument also is of no Force neither, the Fact on which it is grounded being false. For it is clear, that the *Unction* of *Aaron* was different from that of his Sons.

(f) Mr. *Dodwell*, *ubi supra*,

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 551

1. Because he had two Unctions, One peculiar to himself, which was performed *before* the other, by *pouring Oil alone* in great Plenty upon his *Head* (t), where in he seems to have typified Christ, who was *anointed above his Fellows* (u). The other followed, and was common to him and his Sons, nay to their Garments; and was performed, not by *pouring Oil alone* on the *Head*, but by *sprinkling Oil and Blood* upon *Aaron and his Sons*, and their *Garments* (w): For to sprinkle Oil was one usual Way of anointing (x). And on Account of this common Unction, *Aaron's Sons* may be said to have been *anointed*, as *their Father* was *anointed* (y).

2. Because *Aaron's Sons* were anointed once for all, for themselves and their Successors. *Their anointing* was an *everlasting Priesthood* throughout their *Generations* (z). And after them, the inferior Priests were not anointed personally. But those who succeeded *Aaron* in the High-Priesthood, properly so called, were personally an-

(t) *Exod.* xxix. 7. *Levit.* viii. 12. *Psal.* cxxxiii. 2.

(u) *Psal.* xlv. 7. *Heb.* i. 9.

(w) *Exod.* xxix. 21. *Levit.* viii. 30.

(x) *Vid.* *Levit.* viii. 10, 11.

(y) *Exod.* xl. 15. *Comp.* *Exod.* xxviii. 41. and xxx. 30.

(z) *Exod.* xl. 15.

ointed with that Unction, which was peculiar to the High-Priest (a). And it is the Description of the High-Priest, that he was anointed (b), more particularly that the anointing Oil was poured upon his Head (c). Which not only shews, that he was anointed, but confirms, that others were not: because if they had been, this could have been no Description of him. And it is generally agreed by the Learned, that where the anointed Priest is spoken of (d), it is the proper High-Priest who is so called, by way of Distinction from all Inferior Priests.

7. Some of our Adversaries (e) answer to this Effect. "The High-Priest had Substitutes, who had an ordinary Authority to execute his Office in his Absence, Sicknes, Uncleaness, or any other incapacitating Circumstance. We find such Second Priests mentioned in Scripture (f), and Josephus makes El-

(a) Exod. xxix. 29. Levit. vi. 20, 22. 1 Chron. xix. 22.

(b) Levit. xvi. 32. Num. xxxv. 25.

(c) Levit. xxi. 10.

(d) Vid. Levit. iv. 3, 5, 16. Comp. Grotius, and Bishop Kidder upon Exod. xl. 13, 14, 15. and Fagius and Drusius upon Levit. iv. 3, 5.

(e) Vid. Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic. p. 54, 56, 58. Case of Schism, p. 20.

(f) 2 Kings xxv. 18. Jerem. lii. 24. Comp. 2 Kings xxiii. 4. "lem

“*lem* the Son of *Joseph* Substitute to the
“High-Priest *Matthias*, in the Time of
“his Uncleanness (g).

Reply 1. The Scripture no where teaches
us, what the particular Office of those Se-
cond Priests was. And it is strange that
Men should conclude from the Scriptures
mentioning Second Priests, that they had
Authority to execute the Office of the First
High-Priest.

Reply 2. *Josephus's* Account is, “When
“*Matthias* was High-Priest, it happened,
“that another High-Priest also was con-
“stituted for one Day, viz. The Day of
“Expiation; because *Matthias* was invo-
“luntarily polluted the Night before; and
“therefore not being able to perform the
“sacred Office, his Kinsman *Josephus*, Son
“of *Ellemus* (not *Ellem* the Son of *Joseph*,
“as one of our Adversaries mistakes) was
“Co-Priest with Him (h).

Upon which I observe,
1. This Accident was in the Reign of
King *Herod*: and I have already taken no-

(g) *Unity of Priesthood*, &c. p. 34.

(h) *Archæolog.* L. 17. c. 8. Ἐπὶ τῷ Μαρθίᾳ τῷ ἱε-
ρουργῶντι, συμβαίνει καὶ ἕτερον ἀρχιερεῖα κατασκευάζειν πρὸς μίαν ἡ-
μέραν. ἢ Ἰουδαῖοι νομίζουσιν αὐτοὺς. — καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτο ὁ ἀρχι-
ερεὺς ἱερουργεῖν, ἰσχυρῶς ὁ τῷ Ἐλέμῳ συνεργάσθη αὐτῷ συ-
ργῆς αὐ.

tice (1), that in those Times High-Priests were frequently deprived both by Civil Powers and for unjust Causes, and that the *Jews* submitted to the *New* High-Priests constituted in the room of the *Deprived* ones. And since our Adversaries urge the Example of these *Jews*, to shew that High-Priests might have Substitutes: they cannot deny, but that the Example of the *same Jews* is of as good Authority to prove the Lawfulness of submitting to a High-Priest constituted in the room of one Deprived by Civil Powers, or for unjust Causes.

2. *Josephus* relates this, not as a common, but an extraordinary Event. He does not express it, that *Matthias* made this *Josephus* his Substitute, Deputy or Vicegerent, nor does he use any Term which proves this *Josephus's* Subordination to *Matthias*, or Dependence upon him: but says, that *another High-Priest also was constituted* on this suddain Emergency, and that he was constituted *for that one Day*: and on this Account he says, *that he was Co-Priest with Matthias*. Now if even a Bishop who is confessedly of the same Order with an Archbishop,

(1) *Supra*, p. 39.

should be deputed to exercise the Office of his Archbishop upon some particular Occasion, it is not probable that any Historian would on that Account call such a Bishop *another Archbishop*; much less that he would call him *Co-Archbishop* with his Principal.

But thus much is *certain*, that we cannot from this Instance conclude, *that the High-Priesthood, as to the Execution of it, was common to all the inferior Priests, only with Dependence on the proper High-Priest*: any more than we can conclude that the Episcopal Office, as to the Execution of it, is common to all Presbyters, because *Valerius* made his Presbyter *St. Augustin* Co-Bishop of *Hippona* together with himself.

On the contrary, we may conclude from this Instance, *first*, that there was then no *second* Priest among the *Jews*, who had an ordinary Authority to execute the Pontifical Office in the Absence or Incapacity of the High-Priest: for if there had, there would have been no occasion to have constituted this *Josephus* High-Priest; *Secondly*, that it was not intended that even this *Josephus* should have such an ordinary Authority; because he was constituted only for that one Day. From all which it follows, that the Doctrine of our Adversaries was unknown to the *Jews* of those Times,

3. I have already observed (k), that even the express Laws of God have sometimes yielded to the great Law of Necessity: and therefore there is no arguing from this Instance, that it was lawful for a High-Priest to have a Substitute; because this was manifestly a Case of unforeseen and unavoidable Necessity. And if the *Jews*, from the Reason and Expediency of the Thing, and because there was no Law in Scripture to the contrary, rightly concluded, as the Arguments of our Adversaries suppose they did, that they might make another High-Priest in this Case of Necessity: much more might our Church conclude, that she had a Right to put other Bishops in the Place of the Deprived Bishops, tho' they had been deprived by Powers incompetent or supreme *de facto*.

Mr. *Whiston's* Third Negative Argument to prove that neither *Eli* nor any of his Descendents were High-Priests is, *that the Scripture never mentions any Act of theirs peculiar to the High-Priest* (l).

Reply 1. Does the Scripture ever mention any such Act of Mr. *Whiston's* pretended

(k) *Supra*, p. 194.

(l) *Scripture, Politicks*, p. 73.

High-Priests, *Zerabiah, Meraioth, &c.* 3
Not one. It barely mentions their Names.
It does not so much as mention their
Names in that part of Scripture which
was written in or near their own Times,
but only in a Genealogy written after the
Captivity, i. e. many Hundred Years af-
ter they were deceased.

Reply 2. There are many Things be-
sides giving Responses by Urim, related
of *Eli* and his Descendents, which suffici-
ently prove them to have been High-
Priests. *Hanna* vowed to give her Son
Samuel to the Lord; and in Performance
of her Vow brought him to *Eli (m)*.
And he is said to have ministered to the
Lord before, or in the Sight of *Eli the*
Priest (n), just as *Eleazar* and *Ishamar* are
said to have ministered in the Priest's Of-
fice, in the Sight of *Aaron their Father (o)*.

Eli, and under him his Sons *Hophni*
and *Phinehas*, appear manifestly to have
had the supreme and sole Command of
the sacred Ministrations. For they took
of the Sacrifices of the People, what and

(m) 1 Sam. i. 11, 25.

(n) 1 Sam. ii. 11. לַפְּנֵי עֲלִי אֶת פְּנֵי עֲלִי. iii. 1.

(o) Num. iii. 4.

558 A TREATISE against the

when, and in what manner they pleased, and made themselves fat with the CHIEFEST of ALL the Offerings of Israel (p). They had also the Charge of the Ark (q); which Charge Dr. Brett (r) urges as an Argument, that Zadok was High-Priest.

Eli's Sons, Hophni and Phinehas, were guilty of grossly abusing their Sacerdotal Office, and he reprov'd them for it: but because he did not exert his Authority so far as effectually to restrain their Wickedness, God sent the following Message to him, which contains several Proofs that he was the proper High-Priest. Did I plainly appear unto the House of thy Father (Aaron) when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's House? And did I chuse him out of all the Tribes of Israel, to be my Priest, to offer upon mine Altar, to burn Incense, to wear an Ephod before me? And did I give unto the House of thy Father, all the Offerings made by Fire of the Children of Israel? Wherefore kick ye at my Sacrifice, and at mine Offering, which I have commanded in my Habitation, and honourest thy Sons above me, to make your selves fat with the chiefest of all the Offerings of Israel my People? Wherefore the

(p) 1 Sam. ii. 12, &c. 29.

(q) 1 Sam. iv. 4, 11.

(r) Independency of the Church, p. 75.

Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed, that thy House, and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever: but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me: for them that honour me, I will honour: and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed. Behold the Days will come, that I will cut off thine Arm, and the Arm of thy Father's House, and there shall not be an old Man in thine House for ever. And the Man of thine House whom I shall not cut off from thine Altar, shall be to consume thine Eyes, and to grieve thine Heart. And I will raise me up a faithful Priest, that shall do according to that which is in my Heart and my Mind, and I will build him a sure House, and he shall walk before mine anointed for ever. And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left in thy House, shall come and crouch to him for a Piece of Silver, and a Morsel of Bread, and shall say, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the Priest's Offices, that I may eat a Piece of Bread (f). And God repeated this Message by Samuel; I will judge Eli's House for ever, because his Sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not. And therefore I have sworn unto the House of Eli, that the Iniquity of Eli's House shall not

(f) 1 Sam. ii. 27, &c.

be purged with Sacrifice nor Offering for ever (s).

Here God denounces most severe Judgments against *Eli* and his Family, because he did not restrain his Sons. If any other Person but *Eli* were then High-Priest, where was he all this while? Why did not he rebuke and restrain, or attempt to restrain these inferior Priests? If *Eli* were so blameable for not exerting his Paternal or Civil Authority; was not this pretended High-Priest also blameable for not exercising his Pontifical Power? And how then come such severe Judgments to be denounced against *Eli*, and no Censure to be passed upon, nor one Word said of, this supposed High-Priest, in a Matter which was at least as properly the Object of Pontifical, as of Paternal or Civil Government?

It appears probable also, that *Eli* was High-Priest from the following Expressions: *I said indeed, that thy House, and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever: but now, Be it far from me: This implies, that Eli's House had walked before God, and that they should cease*

(s) 1 Sam. iii. 13, 14.

to do so. *Walking* before God sometimes signifies in general, Living piously, or the Discharge of all Duties to God, throughout the whole Course of a Man's Life. Thus God says to *Abraham*, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect* (u). But as it is applied here to *Eli's* Family, it is used as a Synonymous Expression to being honoured by God, and is distinguished from *Honouring* God by Piety. *I said that thy House should walk before me, but now the Lord saith, Them that honour me, I will honour, and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed.* So that it cannot here signify a Pious Life, but some particular *Honour* which was a Reward of Piety, and Piety was the Condition of obtaining and preserving it. So the *being lightly esteemed* here signifies the same as *not walking before God*. But to be lightly esteemed is not Impiety, but the Punishment of it.

And we may conclude that this particular *Honour* of *walking before God*, was some Office relating to God; because *to walk before another*, commonly signifies the Discharge of some Office relating to that other. Thus *Samuel*, upon *Saul's* being made King, tells the People of *Israel*,

(u) Gen. xviii. 1. Comp. 1 Kings viii. 25.

The King walketh before you ; and I have walked before you from my Childhood unto this Day (w) ; i. e. Saul now performs the Office of your King, and I have hitherto performed the Office of your Prophet and Judge.

And we may farther conclude that this *honourable Office* was a *Sacerdotal* one ; because it particularly related to God ; and we know that *Eli* was a Priest ; and the Crime of his Family was abusing their high *Sacerdotal Dignity*, and the Forfeiture of that Dignity was a proper Punishment of that Crime ; and their Loss of this *honourable Office* is in this Prophecy expressed, as to *some* of them, by their being entirely *cut off from God's Altar* ; and as to *others*, by their being the meanest of Priests, and *crouching to a High-Priest of another Family*. Besides, this *honourable Office* was originally promised to *Aaron's Family* in general, as it was afterward to *Eli's Family* in particular. *I said that thy House, and the House of thy Father (Aaron) should walk before me.* This Promise to *Eli* is indeed no where else recorded. But there are many Sayings mentioned in Scripture, which were

(w) 1 Sam. xii. 2.

not related in their proper Times and Places (x). Now it was promised to Aaron's Family, that they should for ever enjoy the Priesthood and proper High-Priesthood (y); but not that they should enjoy any other Office or Honour; which makes it clear, that *walking before God* meant the discharging an Office, and that that Office was a Sacerdotal one. And accordingly these Words are rendered by the Chaldee Paraphrase, *They shall minister before me* (z). And the Syriack and Arabick Versions expound them in the same Sense, and so do most, if not all, Commentators.

Lastly, It is most probable, that these Words meant discharging the Office not only of Priest, but of the proper High-Priest; First, Because, as I have before observed, the Promise here said to have been made to El's House was first made to Aaron's; and the Promise made to Aaron's Family, was that of the proper High-Priesthood, as well as of the Priesthood. Secondly, Because the Privileges comprehended in God's Promise that Aaron and El should walk before God,

(x) Genes. xxiv. 51. xlii. 21.

(y) Exod. xxviii. 43. xxix. 9, 29, 30.

(z) comp. paraphrase.

seem to have been the same with those which are a little before said to have been granted as well as promised to Aaron: and one of those was the proper High-Priesthood. Did I chuse (Aaron) to be my Priest ——— to wear an Ephod before me ———? Wherefore kick ye at my Sacrifice ———? I said that thy House, and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever: but now, Be it far from me.

The Meaning of all which appears to be this; “Did I grant to Aaron such great and distinguishing Favours, and are you so ungrateful to abuse them? I had promised that your Family in particular, as well as I had before promised, that Aaron’s Family in general, should for ever enjoy them. But now, Be it far from me.” And if this be the Meaning, then Eli and Aaron’s walking before God signifies the same with relation to Aaron, as his being God’s Priest, and wearing an Ephod before him, and consequently it signifies also with relation to Eli, his being God’s Priest, and wearing an Ephod before him, as Aaron had done. And which confirms this Sense, Aaron’s having had the Honour to wear an Ephod before God, is mentioned as an Aggravation of Eli’s Ingratitude: but this would not have been so signal an Aggravation of his

Ingra-

Ingratitude, if this Honour had not descended down to him, but only to a different Branch of *Aaron's* Family exclusive of his.

And it is next to certain, that *Aaron's* wearing an *Ephod* before God, implied his discharging the Pontifical Office, and consequently *Eli's* wearing an *Ephod* before the Lord, implied the same. For by *Ephod*, is here undoubtedly meant that *Golden Ephod* (a) which was worn by the proper High-Priest. For *Aaron* wore that *Ephod* before the Lord; and the Word *Ephod*, when applied to *Aaron*, always signifies the *Golden* one. And if it had ever been expressed, (which it is not) that *Aaron* wore a *Linen Ephod* before the Lord: yet since it is here said in general, that *Aaron* wore an *Ephod* before the Lord, without distinguishing which *Ephod*; we ought in all Reason to conclude, that it means chiefly if not only the most noble *Ephod* of the two. Besides, in other Passages, when *Ephod* is put by itself, it generally, and I believe always, means by way of Eminence the Pontifical one (b); unless when it is applied to Idolatrous *Ephods* (c), which

(a) Vid. *Exod.* xxviii. 6.

(b) 1 *Sam.* xxx. 7. *Hos.* iii. 4.

(c) *Jud.* viii. 27.

undoubtedly, in the Esteem of Idolaters, were of the same Nature with that Ephod which peculiarly belonged to God's proper High Priest. And when other Ephods are mentioned, they are called *Linen Ephods* (d), to distinguish them from the High-Priest's Golden robe.

This Prophecy does also prove, that *Eli* was High-Priest on this Account. *Eli* and his House are here opposed to a certain future Priest and his House. *Eli's* Family had despised the Lord; this should be a faithful Priest who should do according to God's Heart and Mind. God had honoured *Eli*, and had placed him in a high Sacerdotal Station, and had promised, that his House should walk before him for ever. Now God declares, I will lightly esteem *Eli's* Family, for their despising me, and I will honour this faithful Priest who shall honour me, and I will build him a sure House, and he shall walk before mine appointed for ever. *Eli's* Sons had taken of the Sacrifices what they pleased, and had made themselves fat with the CHIEFEST OF ALL the Offerings of Israel: This faithful Priest should have the same Power over the Sacrifices which they had thus abused, and their Posterity should come and crouch to him for a Piece of

(d) 1 Sam. ii. 18. xxii. 18. 2 Sam. vi. 14.

Silver, and a Morsel of Bread, and petition to be put into any of the Priest's Offices, that they might get, if it were but a bare Livelihood. Since then this faithful Priest was to succeed into the Privileges of Eli's Family; if we can find what Sacerdotal Dignity he afterwards obtained in Pursuance of this Prophecy; we may know that Eli had enjoy'd the same. As on the other Hand, if we be sure from what Station in the Priesthood Eli's Family fell, we may also be sure that this faithful Priest was advanced into the same.

To find out this the more certainly, I shall premise, that this Prophecy was fulfilled in *Abiathar* and *Zadok*.

This was a Prophecy which was certainly to be fulfilled. For God, when he repeated it to *Samuel*, declared, *that the Iniquity of Eli's House should not be purged with Sacrifice nor Offering for ever*; which demonstrates that the Decree against *Eli's House* was irreversible.

And accordingly it was fulfilled in *Abiathar*. For the Scripture relates, that *Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord, that he might fulfill the Word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the House of Eli in Shiloh* (e).

(e) 1 Kings ii. 27.

If these Words did, as some of our Adversaries contend (f), only express, that Solomon *intended to fulfill* that Prophecy, we might conclude that he *did fulfill* it, because he had so great Power and Wisdom to accomplish his Design, and the Scripture no where intimates that he was disappointed of it. But I shall hereafter shew, that these Words, according to the most common and proper Acceptation of them, signify, that Solomon *actually did fulfill* that Prophecy, without implying whether he had any *Intention to fulfill* it or no. And our Adversaries would have done well, out of those many Passages of Scripture wherein this Expression occurs, to have produced *some*, wherein it signifies, not that a thing was actually fulfilled, but only that it was *intended* to be so.

And farther, supposing this Expression to mean that *Solomon intended to fulfill* the Prophecy; yet the Scripture also adds, that *the King put Zadok the Priest in the room of Abiathar* (g). So that Solomon removed *Abiathar* from his Station, and filled it with *Zadok*, and intirely acted all that he proposed. And consequently if by so acting he did not compass his

(f) Mr. Dodwell's *Defence of Vindic.* p. 51. Mr. Whiston's *Scripture Politicks*, p. 191.

(g) 1 Kings ii. 35.

Design of fulfilling the Prophecy, he must have been mistaken, as to the Sense of it. But if *Solomon* understood the Prophecy right, he did fulfill it, and our Adversaries are mistaken. And I may safely leave it with the Reader to determine, where the Mistake lies.

And if the Scripture had not expressly asserted, that *Solomon* fulfilled this Prophecy, we might have collected it from Reason. For this Prophecy was, that *Eli's* Family should for ever lose their great Power in the Priesthood, and that the faithful Priest and his House should succeed into it, and for ever enjoy it: An Event, so remarkable in it self, and of so great and lasting Consequence, that it is hardly possible it could come to pass without being taken Notice of in sacred History. Now it certainly did not come to pass before *Abiathar*; for till then *Eli's* Family retained their high Station in the Church. And *Abiathar* was in the Fourth Generation from *Eli*, in the utmost Way of counting possible; and such Punishments of the Children for the Parents were not usually deferred beyond the Fourth Generation, according to the Observation of *Mr. Dodwel* himself (b), as well as of other learned Men: and therefore we might reason-

(b) *Ubi supra*, p. 51, 52.

ably expect to find this Prophecy fulfilled in *Abiathar*. Agreeably hereunto, tho' we hear much of *El's* Family till then, yet afterward they are scarce once mentioned. And *Zadok* was so faithful and eminent a Priest, that from him the Priests were called the Sons of *Zadok* by *Ezekiel* (i), who wrote Four Hundred Years after; and our Adversaries contend, that the High-Priesthood continued in *Zadok's* Family till Christ (k). So that we might well have concluded this Event to have been a Completion of the Prophecy, tho' the Scripture had not told us so. But if, as some of our Adversaries contend (l), *This Prophecy was not fulfilled in Abiathar, and Zadok, but Abiathar's Descendants continued till the Captivity, in that Station which he had*: I desire to know when it was fulfilled.

In short, I shall lay it down as a most certain Truth, that this Prophecy was fulfilled in *Abiathar* and *Zadok*. And this is no more than what others of our very Adversaries assert: but then they contend, that *Zadok* before possessed the Government of the Sixteen Courses of *Eleazar's* Line, and the proper High-Priesthood;

(i) *Ezek.* xl. 45. xlii. 19. xlii. 15.

(k) *Vid. Scripture Politicks*, p. 74.

(l) *Enquiry*, &c. p. 13. Letter to Mr. Marshall,

p. 26.

and that upon this Occasion he only obtained the subordinate Government of the Eight Courses of *Ithamar's* Line: As if in the Disability of the Bishop of London to perform his Office, the Care of that Diocese should devolve to the Archbishop of Canterbury (m).

To confute this Imagination, it might be sufficient barely to produce the following Expressions of the Prophecy; *The Lord saith; Them that honour me, I will honour: — and I will raise me up a faithful Priest, and he shall walk before mine anointed for ever. And every one that is left in thy House shall come and crouch to him, and shall say, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the Priest's Offices.* Now could any but the most prejudiced Persons have imagined, that these high Expressions only denoted an Addition of an inferior Office to him who was possessed of the Supreme One? Would it not be absurd for any one to express himself in like manner, when the Care of some Suffragan's See devolves to the Archbishop of Canterbury?

But to be particular; *Every one that is left in thine House, says God, shall come and crouch to him, and shall say, Put me, I pray*

(m) Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindicta. p. 51, 53, 58.
Mr. Collier in Abiathar. Dr. Brett's Independency, p. 78.

thee,

thee, into one of the Priest's Offices. Now this Promise that Zadok, who was of Eleazar's Family, should obtain the Power to distribute Offices in the Priesthood, even to those of Ithamar's Line, seems plainly to imply, that he should obtain the supreme Disposal of Sacerdotal Offices, i. e. in other Words, the High-Priesthood. For the supreme Disposal of Offices is a Mark of supreme Power in Ecclesiastical as well as Civil Matters.

Again, as it had been promised, that *Eli's House should walk before God for ever.* So it is prophecy'd, that *Zadok and his House should walk before God's anointed for ever.* These two Promises are opposed to one another, and the Expression wherein they were delivered is very near the same, and no doubt the ultimate Meaning of both of them is *exactly* the same. I have shewn, that *Eli's walking before God* signified his discharging a Sacerdotal Office: therefore *Zadok's walking before God's anointed*, undoubtedly signified his discharging the same. And which confirms that it was a Sacerdotal Office which was spoken of, it presently follows, that *Zadok* was to have the Power of putting Men into Priest's Offices.

Walking before God's anointed, signifies walking before the Kings of Judah at Jerusalem,

saalem, says Mr. *Whiston* himself, as well as several Commentators (n). This is then according to this Sense, a plain Description of the High-Priest's Office. For it was his Duty to be where the Civil Sovereigns were, that he might be in a Readiness with the Urim and Thummim, when there should be a Necessity to ask Counsel of God (o). Others by God's *anointed* understand Christ: Which Interpretation does not seem so natural as the former. Yet according to it, the Expression of this Promise is more nearly the same with that to *Eli*, *that his House should walk before God for ever*. And since it is certain, that even according to this latter Interpretation this was a Promise that *Zadok* should discharge a Sacerdotal Office, and it is agreed that after *Abiathar's* Deprivation, *Zadok* and his Posterity were High-Priests: it is not credible, that God should here promise them an *inferior* Office over a *Part*; who were to enjoy the *Supreme* Office over the *whole* Priesthood, with which that *inferior* one was not worthy to be named.

And farther, since *Eli's walking before God* is used as a Synonymous Expression to *being honoured by God*; the Prophecy

(n) *Scripture Politicks*, p. 100. Grotius, Vatablus, Jonathan quoted by Drusius.

(o) Vid. Numb. xxvii. 21. 1 Sam. xiv. 3

that

that Zadok should walk before God's anointed, implied also, that God would confer some great Honour upon him. And this will appear still more plain, if we consider the following Expressions of the Prophecy together. I said, that thy House should walk before me: but now, Them that honour me, I will honour, and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed. And I will raise me up a Faithful Priest, who shall do according to that which is in my Heart, and in my Mind, and he shall walk before mine anointed. Which Words seem manifestly to imply, that as Eli's House for their despising God, should be severely punished, should be lightly esteemed, and lose the honourable Station of walking before God: so this Faithful Priest, for honouring God by doing according to his Heart and Mind, should be rewarded and honoured by God, and promoted to the high Dignity of walking before his anointed. This Prophecy then meant, that Zadok should upon this Occasion be advanced in Dignity. But if he had been, as our Adversaries suppose, High-Priest before, the Addition of the subordinate Government of Ithamar's Line would have been an increase of Duty, not of Honour. And farther, it is agreed, that Zadok before was the Chief of Eleazar's Family, and that was the

the highest Dignity, next the proper High-Priesthood : and therefore he could not be advanced in Dignity of Station, unless he were made High-Priest.

The Substance of all which is this. If any one but *Eli* had then been High-Priest, God would probably have rebuked and punished him as well as *Eli*, for not restraining the inferior Priests, *Hophni* and *Phinehas*. God had promised that *Eli's House* should walk before him, and upon this Occasion revoked that Promise : Which implies, that *Eli's House* had walked before God till they forfeited that Privilege : And that Privilege was certainly a Sacerdotal Office, and probably the Pontifical one. This Prophecy was fulfilled in *Zadok* : and therefore *Eli's Family* lost, what *Zadok* then gained. *Zadok* upon this Occasion obtained the supreme Disposal of Ecclesiastical Offices, which was undoubtedly a principal Branch of that Power which peculiarly belonged to the proper High-Priest. The Prediction, that God would honour *Zadok*, and that he should walk before his anointed, meant, that God would prefer him to a more honourable Station in the Priesthood : but he was confessedly so high before, that nothing but the High-Priesthood could raise him higher. And if he had been

High-

High-Priest before, the Office which our Adversaries pretend he obtained upon this Occasion, would have been no Advancement nor Honour to him, but a Burden. Therefore upon the Completion of this Prophecy, Zadok obtained, and Eli's Family lost the proper High-Priesthood.

To proceed to other Things related in Scripture of Eli's Family, which prove them to have been High-Priests: *Abia* Eli's Grandson had the Charge of the Ark (p). *Abimelech* gave David at his Request *Goliath's* Sword which had been dedicated to God, and hallowed Bread, which it was not lawful for any but Priests to eat (q). David applied to *Abimelech* alone, and did not ask him to introduce him to any higher Priest. And *Abimelech* granted David's Desires, without being ordered to do so by any Superior. From whence it appears, that *Abimelech* had the Command and Disposal of the Holy Bread, and dedicated Things; nay, so far as to judge when he might dispense with the Letter of an express Law of God relating to them.

Mr. *Whiston's* 4th Negative Argument, that neither *Eli* nor any of his Descendants were High-Priests, is, "that the Scripture History never intimates any

(p) 1 Sam. xiv. 3, 18. (q) 1 Sam. xxi. 6, 9.

“ Exclusion of the Family of *Eleazar*, nor
 “ any Appointment or Anointing of that
 “ of *Ithamar* in his stead (r).

Reply. Many Passages of Scripture certainly prove, that *Ithamar*'s Descendents were High-Priests for several Generations ; which is a sufficient *Intimation* that *Eleazar*'s Family was excluded for that Time. The Scripture indeed does not intimate at what exact Time, and for what particular Reasons the one were excluded and the others appointed. But that does not prove, that no such Thing was done. Our Adversaries contend that there were several High-Priests, from *Phinehas* to the Time of *Eli*. And this must be true, unless we should suppose, contrary to all Probability, that *Phinehas*, who was no young Man at his Father's Death (f), was High-Priest from thence to the Time of *Eli*, i. e. about 200 Years (t). Now the Scripture no where expresses or intimates the least Tittle concerning these High-Priests. And since the Silence of Scripture does not disprove that there were such High-Priests, it cannot disprove, that *Eleazar*'s Family was excluded.

(r) *Scripture Politicks*, p. 73.

(f) *Comp. Exod. vi. 25. Num. xxv. 7. Jos. xxiv. 33.*

(t) *Vid. Mr. Marshal's Chronology.*

ed, and *Ithamar's* advanced to that Dignity.

In short then, our Adversaries have attempted to prove, that neither *Eli* nor any of his Descendents were High-Priests, by producing two Genealogies which are nothing to the purpose, and four Negative Arguments, whereof One proves nothing, and the other Three have turned against them. For I have shewn that our Saviour himself calls *Abiathar* High-Priest; and that *Eli's* Family gave Responses by *Urim*, which none but High-Priests could do, and that several other Things are recorded of them in Scripture, which plainly prove them to have been High-Priests: whereas the Scripture barely mentions the Names of the other pretended High-Priests. And our Adversaries do in effect confess the Force of our Proofs: because the *Case of Schism* does, as I before observed, own *Abiathar* to have been in Fact High-Priest; and Mr. *Whiston* says in one Place (u), *Perhaps the Families of Eleazar and Ithamar might be both after a sort High-Priests at the same Time, like Annas and Caiaphas*; and still more fully in another Passage (w), *Eli's House had for many Years taken such State, and obtained such Power as*

(u) *Scripture Politics*, p. 73.

(w) *Ibid.* p. 99.

only could regularly be claimed by the true High-Priests. And how then he could deny, that the Scripture mentions any Act of theirs peculiar to High-Priests, is more than I understand.

Fourthly, Our Adversaries argue, that *Abiathar* was not High-Priest, because *Zadok* was the proper High-Priest even in King *David's* Time. And this they attempt to make out by several Proofs.

"1. *Zadok* is always named before *Abiathar*, a sure Argument that *Zadok* was the High-Priest (x).

Reply 1. So *Annas* is always named before *Caiaphas* in the New Testament (y), and yet it is certain, that *Caiaphas* was then the proper High-Priest. So with us, those who are Men of the greatest Fame, or who have the best Interest at Court, and thereby a principal Influence on publick Affairs, are generally named both in Discourse and History too, before others who are their Superiors in Title and Office. And there are many like Instances. And therefore this would not be a sure Argument that *Zadok* was High-Priest, tho' we should not at this Distance of Time be able to assign the Cause, why

(x) *Dr. Brett's Indep.* p. 76. *Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic.* p. 53, 57. *Mr. Collier's Diction. in Abiathar.* *Mr. Whiston,* p. 101.

(y) *Luke* iii. 2. *Acts* iv. 6.

he was named before *Abiathar*. But the Scripture it self informs us of one very good Reason for it, *viz.* because *Zadok* was a *Seer*, 2 *Sam.* xv. 27. *Art not thou a Seer? Return into the City in Peace.* There are indeed some Commentators who interpret that Place otherwise: But many others agree with our Translation, and ours is the literal Version, and suits with the Context. For it is brought as an Argument that *Zadok* might return to *Jerusalem* in Peace and Safety, tho' *Jerusalem* was then under the Power of *Absolom*. And it was a good Argument, that *Absolom* would not dare to hurt him, because he was a Prophet. And I cannot conjecture why any should question *Zadok's* being a *Seer*, except because he is only once so called, and we have no Prophecy of his recorded: but that is the Case of several other Prophets. For Instance, as the Prophet *Gad* is called King *David's* *Seer* (z): So *Jeduthan* is called, the King's *Seer* (a), and *Heman*, the King's *Seer* in the Words of God (b), and *Miriam*, the Prophetess (c). And these three Persons are

(z) 2 *Sam.* xxiv. 11.

(a) 2 *Chron.* xxxv. 15.

(b) 1 *Chron.* xxv. 5.

(c) *Exod.* xv. 20. *Comp. Num.* xii. 2. and *Mic.* vi. 4.

only once so entitled: and we have no Prophecy recorded of any of them; unless the following Song of *Miriam*, sung on occasion of the *Egyptians* being drowned in the Red Sea, were a Prophecy: Sing ye to the Lord: for he hath triumphed gloriously; the Horse and his Rider hath he thrown into the Sea (d).

Reply 2. Tho' *Zadok* be commonly named before *Abiathar*, probably because he was a Seer: yet when he is formally ranked according to his particular and ordinary Station among the *Aaronites*, he is introduced as one of a Second Order, and as inferior to *Abiathar*. This appears from several Passages, some whereof I shall hereafter produce in my Reply to other Arguments of our Adversaries: and at present shall only mention that Passage which relates *David's* appointing the Courses of the Priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 3. And *David* distributed them both *Zadok* of the Sons of *Eleazar*, and *Ahimelech* of the Sons of *Ithamar*; according to their Offices, in their Service, Ver. 5, 6. Thus were they divided by Lot, one Sort with another: And *Shemaiah* wrote them before the King and the Princes, and *Zadok* the Priest, and A.

(d) Exod. xv. 21.

himelech the Son of Abiathar. Here Zadok and the Son of Abiathar are introduced as the two Chiefs of the Families of Eleazar and Ithamar, and as acting respectively in behalf of those Families: and consequently Zadok was only a secondary Priest. For the proper High-Priest was undoubtedly Head of both Families.

After the Allotments of the several Courses of the Priests are recorded, it follows, *Ver. 19.* These were the Orderings of them in their Service, to come into the House of the Lord, according to their Manner, under Aaron their Father, as the Lord God of Israel had commanded him (David). Upon which the Enquirer (e) observes very well, "Ahimelech had the Course of ministering Priests of Ithamar's Line, put under him by David, subordinate to the High-Priest." And by Parity of Reason I infer, that Zadok had the Course of Ministering Priests of Eleazar's Line put under him by David, subordinate to the High-Priest. And consequently he could not be the High-Priest himself. For he could not be the High-Priest, and yet subordinate to the High-Priest.

(e) *Pag. 10.*

And farther, from these Passages it follows, that *Abiathar* was the Person who was then High-Priest. For there is no question but *Abiathar* or *Zadok* was so: and since it appears that *Zadok* was not, it remains that *Abiathar* was. And if he had not been so, he and not his Son *Ahimelech* would have been the Head of *Itamar's* Line. Besides these Passages represent *Ahimelech*, *Abiathar's* Son, as a Priest of the same Rank with *Zadok*, and as Head of one Branch of *Aaron's* Family, as *Zadok* was of the other. And if *Zadok* were only equal to the Son, he could not be superior to the Father. Lastly, Many Commentators (f) are of Opinion, that by *Aaron* in this Passage is meant the High-Priest, who at that Time possessed the Place of his Ancestor *Aaron*. And I have shewn, that *Zadok* was not then High-Priest. And besides, he is in this very Chapter mentioned before, and after this Verse, by the Name of *Zadok*: and it is on that account also unlikely, that he should be here called *Aaron*, without the least Intimation that he is understood by that Name. According to this Sense then, *Abiathar* is here entituled *Aaron* and the Father of the Priests, and *Zadok* is said to be under him.

(f) Lyra, Grotius, Poole.

This *Ahimelech* has strangely perplexed our Adversaries. Some of them (g) pretend to mistake *him*, who was really our *Abiathar's* Son, and is mentioned here at the latter end of *David's* Reign, for *Ahimelech*, *Abiathar's* Father, who was slain by King *Saul* (h). Mr. *Dodwel* sometimes questions whether *Abiathar* had any Sons, sometimes he believes more truly that he had (i). For *Jonathan*, another Son of *Abiathar* is mentioned even in *Adonijah's* Conspiracy (k). In another Place (l) he tries to make us believe, that *Ahimelech* might be the same Person with our *Abiathar*. "Perhaps, says he, there may have been an easy Transposition of *Ahimelech* the Son of *Abiathar*, instead of *Abiathar* the Son of *Ahimelech*. And a little below, "Possibly both Father and Son had both Names, that of *Ahimelech* and of *Abiathar* also.

Reply 1. I might as well say, that in the Places where *Zadok* is named first, there is a Transposition of his Name in-

(g) *Scripture Politicks*, p. 101. *Enquiry*, p. 10, 11. *Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic.* p. 53.

(h) 1 *Sam.* xxii.

(i) *Ibid.* p. 52, 53.

(k) 1 *Kings* i. 42.

(l) *Ibid.* p. 54.

stead of *Abiathar*; or that both Persons had both Names.

Reply 2. Mr. *Dodwel* offers no Proof of these Things, except that he says, *It is certain that Ahimelech the Father is called Abiathar, Mark ii. 26.* But this, if true, would not prove that our *Abiathar* was also called *Ahimelech*: and besides, I have already shewn, that our *Abiathar* not only may be, but most probably is meant in that Place of *St. Mark*. And the Scripture does, in three several Passages, and in Books written by different Authors (*m*), expressly speak of *Ahimelech* the Son of *Abiathar*. And to suppose that *Abiathar* the Son of *Ahimelech* is meant in all these Places, is to take away all Certainty from Scripture, and to shew less Regard to inspired Writers, than we should to profane Historians of any tolerable Credit.

2. "*Zadok* is said to have been Ruler "*(n)* or Prince "*(o)* of the *Aaronites*, "*1 Chron. xxvii. 17, 22.* where the "*Princes of the Twelve Tribes* are recorded up in *David's Time* (*p*).

(*m*) 2 Sam. viii. 17. 1 Chron. xviii. 16. xxiv. 6.

(*n*) כֹּהֵן.

(*o*) שֹׁרֵט.

(*p*) Mr. Collier's Dictionary in *Abiathar*. Dr. Brett's *Independency*, p. 75.

Reply 1.

Reply 1. True : but how does it appear, that this was the same Office with the High-Priesthood? The several Chiefs of the other Tribes here reckoned up, have all the same Title given them : and there is as much reason to think, that the Authority of all of them over their respective Tribes was of one and the same Nature, as that the Twelve Captains over the Courses of the Twelve Months, of whom an account is given immediately before, had all the same kind of Office : which no one ever doubted. And therefore since all these Rulers could not be High-Priests, it cannot be concluded from this Passage, that any one of them was so ; but on the contrary, that the Office of *Rulers* of the Tribes was not of a Sacerdotal, but of a Civil or Military Nature, or both. And what confirms that this Office was of a Military Nature, and that it certainly was not the High-Priesthood, is that when *the Men of War* are reckoned up *who came to David to turn the Kingdom of Saul to him*, one *Jehoiada* is said to have *born this Office*, and *Zadok* seems to be called one of his Followers, 1 Chron. xii. 27, 28. *Jehoiada was the Leader, or Ruler (q) of the Aaronites, and with him were*

(q) 711.

three Thousand and seven Hundred, And Zadok a young Man mighty of Valour, and of his Father's House twenty and two Captains. From hence first it is probable that the Office of Ruler of the Aaronites, which Zadok afterward obtained, was a Military one, but certain that it was not the High-Priesthood, because this Jehoiada was never High Priest. Next this Passage not only names Zadok after Jehoiada; a Consideration which ought to be of Weight with our Adversaries: but it also seems to represent, that Zadok was with Jehoiada, and which comes all to one, that Jehoiada was the Leader or Ruler of Zadok. For Zadok was one of the Aaronites. And therefore if our Adversaries will have it, that the Ruler of the Aaronites was a Sacerdotal Office, they must grant, that Jehoiada was superior to Zadok as to his Sacerdotal Station: which Concession would overturn their whole Hypothesis.

Reply 2. The Words of this Passage are; The Ruler of the Levites was Hashabiah the Son of Kemuel, of the Aaronites, Zadok. From whence if our Adversaries would be consistent with themselves, they ought to inter, that Hashabiah was superior to Zadok, because he is first named: but we may well collect from these Words, either

either that this was not a Sacerdotal Office, or that *Zadok* was not then High-Priest, because if he had been, he would have been *Ruler* of the *Levites* as well as the *Aaronites*.

Reply 3. Those *Rulers* of the *Tribes*, whatever their Office were, appear not to have been of the first Rank and Station. For those who are recorded after them in the end of the Chapter, seem to be brought in as the Principal Men in *Israel*, and as superior to these *Rulers*. Also *Jonathan David's Uncle* was a Counsellor, a wise Man, and a Scribe; and *Jehiel the Son of Hachmoni*, was with the *King's Sons*. And *Ahithophel* was the *King's Counsellor*, and *Hushai the Archite* was the *King's Companion*. And after *Ahithophel* was *Jehoiada the Son of Benaiah*, and *Abiathar*: and the General of the *King's Army* was *Joab*. From which Passage it is probable, that as *Joab* was superior to the *Rulers* of the other *Tribes*: so *Abiathar* was superior to *Hushai* and *Zadok* the *Rulers* of the *Tribe of Levi*.

3. " When *David* fled from *Abisolom*,
 " and the *Priests* followed him with the
 " *Ark*, tho' *Abiathar* was there, yet the
 " Charge of the *Ark* plainly belonged to
 " *Zadok*, for it was he, and not *Abiathar*,
 " conducted those that bore it; and he
 " and not *Abiathar*, was required by the
 " *King* to carry it back to *Jerusalem* (r).

(r) *Dr. Brett's Indep.* p. 75, 76.

Reply 1.

Reply 1. This proves that *Eli* and his Descendents were High-Priests. For I have already shewn, that they had the Charge of the Ark.

Reply 2. This Passage does not prove, that the Charge of the Ark did not belong to *Abiathar*. The Words are these (f), *And lo Zadok also, and all the Levites with him, bearing (t) the Ark of the Covenant of God, and they set down the Ark of God; and Abiathar went up, or as it may be translated, For Abiathar had gone up (u), until all the People had done passing out of the City. And the King said unto Zadok, carry back the Ark of God, in the Hebrew Cause the Ark of God to return (w) into the City —. The King said unto Zadok the Priest, Art not thou a Seer? Return into the City in Peace, and your two Sons with you, Ahimaaz thy Son, and Jonathan the Son of Abiathar —. Zadok therefore and Abiathar carried the Ark of God again, in the Hebrew, Caused the Ark of God to return (x) to Jerusalem.*

(f) 2 Sam. xv. 24, 25, 27, 29.

(t) נשאים.

(u) ויעל אביתר. ו often signifies *for*, and a converted future stands for the preterpluperfect as well as the preterperfect Tense.

(w) השב.

(x) וישב.

Here

Here indeed *Zadok* is named first, for which I have accounted already. But first, this Passage does not prove, that *Abiathar* did not conduct those who bore the Ark. For it by no means follows that he did not, because he is not related to have had a share in corporally bearing the Ark, as *Zadok* had. For that was no Mark of Authority, but was the Burden of the Levites as well as sometimes of the Priests (y). And the most probable Meaning of the following Words; *They set down the Ark; For Abiathar had gone up Mount Olivet (z) with the Ark, until all the People had done passing out of the City;* is, that *Abiathar* stopped upon perceiving all the People to be come out of the City, and that upon his stopping, they set down the Ark. Which shews that *Abiathar* was the Principal in conducting those who bore the Ark, and that they observed and were governed by his Motions.

Secondly, If *David* had spoken only to *Zadok* to cause the Ark to return to Jerusalem, there might have been no other Reason for it, but that *Zadok* was the foremost of those who corporally bore the Ark. But

(y) Num. iv. 15. Jos. viii. 33.

(z) Comp. 2 Sam. xv. 31.

this Passage does not prove, that the Words of *David* were not also to be extended to *Abiathar*. For it is common, when a Command is given to several Persons together, for only one of them to be expressed by Name, either because he is nearest at hand, or for some such accidental Reason. And so, tho' *David* only named *Zadok*, yet he might imply also *Abiathar*: and it seems probable that he did, from these Words; *Return into the City, and YOUR two Sons with YOU (a), Ahimaaz thy Son, and Jonathan the Son of Abiathar*. And farther it is said, *Zadok therefore and Abiathar caused the Ark to return to Jerusalem*. And we may probably collect, that *David's* Command was given to *Abiathar*, because he was one who executed it. At least we may certainly conclude from these Words, that *Abiathar* as well as *Zadok* had the Charge of the Ark, because he as well as *Zadok* caused it to return.

Reply 3. It is manifest, that what *Zadok* did in this Instance was only accidental, and that he had not the ordinary and constant Charge of the Ark. For the Writer of the *Chronicles* having related (b), that *David brought up the Ark to the City of*

(a) וְיָנִים אִתָּךְ

(b) 1 Chron. xv. 29. xiv. 37.

592 A TREATISE against the

David, and left there Asaph and his Brethren to minister before it continually, adds (c), that (David left) Zadok the Priest and his Brethren the Priests, before the Tabernacle of the Lord in the High Place that was at Gibeon to offer Burnt-Offerings unto the Lord continually. And it is a convincing Argument that Zadok was not High-Priest, that he should be appointed to officiate at Gibeon, and not in the principal City, the Residence of the King and his Court, and especially of the Ark of God.

4. "We are directly assured, 1 Chron. xxix. 22. that during David's Life, they anointed Zadok to be the High-Priest (d),

Reply 1. We no where find that the High-Priest ever was, or was required to be twice anointed with a Pontifical Unction. And I am persuaded that our Adversaries themselves will allow, that it was unlawful for a High-Priest to be twice so anointed, as it is for a Bishop to be twice ordained. And therefore Zadok was not High-Priest before the anointing here mentioned. Now this Anointing is recorded to have been upon, or after Solomon's being

(c) Ver. 39, 40.

(d) Mr. Whiston, p. 101. Mr. Collier's Dictionary in Abiathar.

made King a *second Time* (e), and so overturns all the foregoing Arguments of our Adversaries, which if they proved any thing, would prove him to have been High-Priest before.

Reply 2. Our Adversaries imagine, that this anointing of Zadok must have been during David's Life, and consequently before Abiathar's Deprivation; because after this follows an account of David's Death (f). But it is common with sacred, as well as profane Writers, when they have begun a History, to anticipate and relate the whole, or an Abstract of it, before the Time in which it happened. Thus this Writer having mentioned in the latter end of David's Reign, how he solemnly declared to all Israel, that God had chosen Solomon to sit on his Throne, and to build the House of God, and how He and the People offered great Gifts to enable Solomon to go on with the Work (g), proceeds and gives a short account of Solomon's History, even beyond the Time of David's

(e) *They made Solomon King the second time, and anointed him to the Lord to be chief Governour, and Zadok to be Priest.*

(f) *1 Chron. xxix. 28.*

(g) *1 Chron. xxviii. 5, 6. xxix. 1, 6, 7.*

Life. Which is clear, because he relates (b), that the Lord bestowed upon Solomon such Royal Majesty, as had not been on any King before him in Israel. Now no one can suppose this to have been true of Solomon while his Father was living: On the contrary it was after David's Death, that God gave the Promise to Solomon, that he would bestow such Honour upon him (i).

Reply 3. Not only Grotius (k), but even several Papists (l) are of Opinion, that Solomon was made King the first time upon Adonijah's Conspiracy, and that the second time here spoken of was after David's Death. And indeed the History of Adonijah's Conspiracy seems plainly to imply, that he was not actually made King before (m): and it was natural, that his Title should be recognized upon his Father's Demise. It is said indeed, that David made Solomon King, 1 Chron. xxiii. 1. But some (n) understand only by that, that

(b) 1 Chron. xxix. 25.

(i) 2 Chron. i. 12.

(k) In locum.

(l) Lyra, à Lapide, Tirinus in Locum; Tostatus Abulensis in Chron. xxiii. 1. & in locum.

(m) Vid. 1 Kings i. 30, 35.

(n) Vid. Poole on 1 Chron. xxiii. 1.

he declared him his Successor: *Others* (a) conceive it to be related by way of Anticipation. However, *Solomon* was undoubtedly made King the *second*, if not the *first* time, upon *Adonijah's* Conspiracy. And consequently *Zadok* was not High-Priest at soonest till after *Adonijah's* Conspiracy.

So that in short none of the Arguments of our Adversaries prove that *Zadok* was High Priest during *David's* Life; but on the contrary they have given me occasion to shew, *first*, that tho' *Zadok* be named before *Abiathar*, probably because he was a Seer: yet when *Zadok* is formally marshalled according to his Sacerdotal Station, *Abiathar* is probably called *Aaron*, and the Father of *Zadok*: but *Zadok* is certainly ranked as only equal to *Abiathar's* Son, and as Head of *Eleazar's* Family; whereas the proper High-Priest was superior to all the Priests, and was Head and Father of both the sacerdotal Families. 2. That in like manner in another Passage, *Abiathar* is placed among those who were undoubtedly the greatest Officers in *Israel*; and *Zadok* is introduced among the Rulers of particular Tribes, who seem to have been only a Secondary Order of Men; and

(a) *Lyra & Toftatus Abulenfis.*

he is certainly represented to have been the Ruler, not of a whole Tribe, but of the *Aaronites*, as one *Hafhabiah* was to the *Levites*; whereas the proper High-Priest was manifestly the Head both of *Levites* and *Aaronites*. 3. That *Abiathar* had the Charge of the Ark, as his Ancestors notoriously had before him; but that *Zadok's* ordinary Station was at *Gibeon*, and not at *Jerusalem*, where the Ark was. Lastly, That *Zadok* was not anointed High-Priest till after *Adonijah's* Conspiracy: which strongly confirms, that he was put into that Station in the room of *Abiathar*, when *Abiathar* was, as we say, deprived for siding with *Adonijah*: which Point comes next to be considered.

II. Our Adversaries answer, that *Solomon* did not deprive *Abiathar* of the High-Priesthood. Concerning this Point they differ much from one another, as well as from us: But all their Opinions may be reduced to these, either that *Abiathar* was not deprived at all, or not formally, or not of the High-Priesthood, or not by *Solomon*.

I. Some of them attempt to prove that *Abiathar* was not deprived at all by the following Arguments.

1. The

1. The Enquirer (p) says, "The original Hebrew is *וְיָצִיא*, which ought to be rendered thus, *And Solomon WOULD HAVE thrust out, &c.* It is a Verb of the Future Tense, in the Preter Signification, and is the only way that Language has to express the Potential Mood without Circumlocution: tho' sometimes this sort of Construction is used otherwise.

Reply. Verbs, like this, in the Future Tense with the Conversive *י*, do not only sometimes, but strictly and properly signify the same as the Preter Tense of the Indicative Mood. And what unluckily spoils this Author's Criticism is, that it is indisputable, that Solomon not only would, but actually did put Benaiah over the Host (q): which is also expressed by the Future Tense with the Conversive *י* (r). And besides, Solomon's putting Zadok the Priest in the room of Abiathar, happens to be expressed by the Preter Tense (s). The Enquirer seems aware of this, and to reinforce his Argument, adds,

(p) *Enquiry, &c.* p. 14.

(q) For afterward it follows, *Benaiah the Son of Jehoiada was over the Host, 1 Kings iv. 4.*

(r) *1 Kings ii. 35.* *וְיָצִיא*.

(s) *Ibid.* *וְיָצִיא*.

598 A TREATISE against the

2. "The Will and Intention is sometimes taken in Scripture for the Act. Thus *Araunah* is said to HAVE GIVEN to King David, that which he only WOULD HAVE GIVEN, but did not, for David paid for them, 2 Sam. xxiv. 23.

Reply 1. At this rate one might interpret away all the Scripture History only by saying, when a Person is related actually to have done an Action, that the Will is taken for the Act.

2. A thing indeed cannot be strictly said to have been given till it has been accepted. Yet because the Action of the Giver is so much more considerable than that of the Receiver, and Acceptance generally follows of Course; it is common in all Language, when the Giver has done his Part, to say in a larger Sense that he has given, even before his Gift is formally accepted. But it does not therefore follow that this sort of Construction is to be extended to Matters of a different Nature.

3. Our Adversaries argue, "that after the supposed Deposing of *Abiathar*, he is called High-Priest, 1 Kings iv. 4. which shews that he continued on the same Establishment, as in *David's* Time (t).

(t) *Case of Schism*, p. 20. *Mr. Collier's Dictionary* in *Abiathar*. *Mr. Whiston, ubi supra*. p. 103. *Enquiry*, &c. p. 13. *Dr. Brett's Indep.* p. 78.

Reply,

Reply. If this were true, it would only prove, that *Abiathar* was restored to the High-Priesthood again. But this cannot be true, if what *Solomon* did were, as it certainly was, a Completion of the Prophecy, that God when he begun, would for ever punish the Family of *Eli* (u). And as to the Text referred to, the Words of it are, *Zadok and Abiathar were the Priests, not the High-Priests.* But not to insist upon that, it is not certain that it is the Design of that Passage to record those who were at that particular Time High-Priests under *Solomon*, but who at any time before had been so. Thus *Asahel* is reckoned among *David's mighty Men* (w), and *Ahitophel* among his greatest Officers (x), many Years after they were both dead. And therefore this does not prove that *Abiathar* had then so much as the Title of High-Priest.

But supposing him to have had the Title, it will not follow, that he had the Office. For *Annas* is called High-Priest in the New Testament (y), after he had long ceased to be so: and at this Day the

(u) Vid. 1 Sam. ii. 32. iii. 12, 13, 14.

(w) 2 Sam. xxiii. 24.

(x) 1 Chron. xxvii. 33.

(y) Luke iii. 2.

deposed Greek Patriarchs always enjoy the Title of Patriarchs.

4. "After the supposed Deposition of *Abiathar*, the Revenue of High-Priest continued with him. For he was commanded to retire to his Fields at *Anathoth*, 1 Kings ii. 26. which Fields of *Anathoth* belonged to the Priests, Josh. xxi. 18. and therefore he could only hold them in Right of the High-Priesthood (z).

Reply. *Anathoth* belonged indeed to the Priests: but I cannot conceive how our Adversaries could from thence infer, that *Abiathar* must necessarily possess these Fields in the Right of the High-Priesthood. Why might he not possess them as *Ithamar's* Heir? Why might he not buy them, as it is certain that *Jeremiah* afterward bought a Field there (a)?

But supposing *Abiathar* to have possessed these Fields at first, as High-Priest: we could not from his retaining them conclude, that he continued High-Priest. *Nicholas de Farnham* Bishop of *Durham* resigned that Bishoprick in the Year 1249,

(z) *Case of Schism*, p. 20. *Mr. Whiston*, p. 103. *Dr. Brett's Indep.* p. 77.

(a) *Jerem.* xxxii. 9.

and in the beginning of the next Year, *Walter de Kirkham* was constituted Bishop in his room. *Farnham* upon his Resignation had three Manors appointed him out of that Bishoprick, and the King and the Pope confirmed that Appointment. Some Persons afterward applied to the Pope in favour of *Kirkham*, desiring him to take those Manors away from *Farnham*, and give them to *Kirkham*, alledging that they were a third Part of the Revenue of the Bishoprick; and, indeed, one of our ancient Chronicles (b) assures us, that they were worth a Thousand Marks yearly; a great Sum in those Times. But those Men were repulsed by the Pope with Disgrace, and *Farnham* retained those Manors as long as he lived, and died in one of them, Nine Years after his Resignation (c). When Dr. *Grindall* was about to resign the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury*, he desired, that the Palace of *Croydon*, and a yearly Pension might be assigned him for his Life, out of the Revenues of that

(b) *Annales Waverleiensis* in anno 1249. *Nicholaus de Farisham Dunelmensis Episcopus* Episcopatum suum hoc anno resignabat, percipiens tamen de eodem Episcopatu singulis annis mille marcas.

(c) See this whole Account at large in *Matt. Paris*, in the Years 1249, 1251, 1257.

Archbishoprick : and he represented, that this was no more than had been granted in Case of all the Resignations which he had seen or heard of ; and for Instance, quoted the abovementioned Precedent of *Farnham* (d). Now can any one be so absurd as to imagine, that *Farnham* after his Resignation and the Constitution of his Successor, continued Bishop of *Durham*, because he retained those Manors ; Or that Dr. *Grindal* would have continued Archbishop of *Canterbury*, notwithstanding he had resigned, if he had been suffered to enjoy the Palace of *Croydon* : Or that if the Parliament, when it deprived Archbishop *Sanicroft*, had banished him to *Croydon* ; this would have proved him not to have been ejected out of the Archbishoprick ? The Act 1 *W. & M. Seff. 1. Cap. 8.* empowered the late King to grant to such Twelve of the Nonjuring Clergy as he should think fit, the third Part of their Ecclesiastical Benefices for their Subsistence. But will our Adversaries argue, that such Twelve were for that Reason not deprived ? In short, Priests who had a Blemish possessed the Title and Maintenance of Priests, and yet had no Right to

(d) Vid. *Mr. Strype's Life of Archbishop Grindal.*
L. 2. c. 14.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 603

exercise the Sacerdotal Function (e). And therefore there is no collecting from *Abiathar's* retaining the Title and some Part of the Revenue of the High-Priest, that he continued in the Office.

None then of our Adversaries Arguments prove, that *Abiathar* was not Deprived: and there are several Arguments which plainly shew the contrary. The Scripture not only says expressly, *Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord* (f), which one would think might be convincing: but the Scripture also says, that *Solomon* did this, *that he might fulfill the Word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the House of Eli in Shiloh.* Which Expression does, as I shall hereafter shew, signify, that *Solomon* actually fulfilled that Prophecy: and I have also already shewn from other Arguments, that he fulfilled it: and that Prophecy could not be fulfilled, while *Abiathar* continued High-Priest. And to put this Matter past all Doubt, the Scripture adds, that *the King put Zadok the Priest in the room of A-*

(e) *Levit.* xxi. 21, 22. vi. 26, 29. xii. 6, 7. xxiv. 9. *Matt.* xii. 4.

(f) *1 Kings* ii. 27.

604 A TREATISE against the

biathar (g) : which demonstrates that *Abiathar's* Place must be void for *Zadok* to come into it.

Dr. Brett (h) says, that the Original is, *The King GAVE Zadok the Priest for Abiathar.*

Reply. True, and that Hebrew Phrase properly signifies the appointing one Officer in the Place of another (i); and therefore is well rendered in our Translation. And even in our Language it signifies the very same. For Instance, when an Archbishop of *Canterbury* is dead, and the King has nominated another in his room, we may properly say ; The King has given us a new Archbishop for our old one.

Dr. Brett goes on ; “ If our King
“ should imprison the Bishop of *London*,
“ and then bid the Archbishop of *Canter-*
“ *bury* (to whom it belongs of Course,
“ during the Disability of the proper Bi-
“ shop) to take Care of that Diocese :
“ This would be giving the People of
“ *London* the Archbishop of *Canterbury*
“ for their own Bishop.

(g) 1 *Kings* ii. 35.

(h) *Indep.* p. 78.

(i) Vid. *Gen.* xli. 41, 43. 1 *Sam.* xii. 13. 2 *Sam.* xix. 13. 1 *Kings* v. 1, 5. viii. 20. 1 *Chron.* xii. 18. 2 *Chron.* vi. 10.

Reply,

Reply. This supposes a Consequential, if not a Formal Deprivation or Suspension. But not to insist upon that Point now, which is to be considered hereafter; in such a Case, it could not be said, as it is in ours, that the *King* gave, but that the *Law* or *Constitution* gave, the People of *London* the Archbishop of *Canterbury* for their own Bishop. When King *Charles* the First suspended Archbishop *Abbot*, and commission'd Four Bishops to supply his Place, it might properly be said, that the King gave to the Province of *Canterbury* those Four Bishops instead of their Archbishop. But when the late King *James* suspended the Bishop of *London*, without giving any particular Commission to Archbishop *Sancroft* to supply his Place: did any Man ever say, that the King gave the People of *London* that Archbishop for their own Bishop? Besides, it is said in the very same Words, and in the very same Verse, that *the King put Benaiah the Son of Jehoiada in the room of Joab over the Host*, as well as, that *the King put Zadok the Priest in the room of Abiathar*. And therefore since it is certain that *Joab's* Place was actually void, there is no Colour to question but that *Abiathar's* was so too.

2. Some of our Adversaries imagine, that *Abiathar* was indeed deprived in effect, but not formally.

And first some fancy, that *Solomon* barely banished *Abiathar* to *Anathoth*, or confined and imprisoned him there; and only thereby consequentially deprived him, the Office of Priesthood being limited to *Jerusalem* (k).

Reply 1. If Banishment or Imprisonment could consequentially deprive a High-Priest; thence it follows, *first*, that he could not appoint Deputies, nor were other Priests legally empowered to execute his Office: contrary to what our Adversaries (l) maintain as a main support of their Cause. *Secondly*, That Banishment and Imprisonment may consequentially deprive Bishops and Presbyters, and leave the Church at liberty in such a Case of Necessity to submit to the new Bishops and Presbyters constituted in the room of those banished or imprisoned, that the People may retain the Benefit of a Christian Ministry and Sacraments. Yet this also is what our Adversaries deny, saying, that "if the Christian People

(k) *Mr. Collier's Diction. in Abiathar. Dr. Brett's Indep. p. 77. Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic. p. 47, &c. Estius on 1 Kings ii. 27.*

(l) *Mr. Dodwel, ibid. p. 54--56. Case of Schism, p. 20.*
 " have

"have not that which they cannot have; it will not be imputed to them as their Fault (m)." But the same might as well be said with relation to the *Jews*. For there was no more a Necessity then, that the High-Priest should perform his Pontifical Office, for Instance, that he should perform the annual Expiation by entering into the Holy of Holies, than there is a Necessity now of the Administration of Baptism and the Lord's-Supper.

Reply 2. All this is pure Imagination, without any Proof to support it. For the Scripture does not say, that Solomon banished *Abiathar* to *Anathoth*, and thereby consequentially depriv'd him, but it says, that Solomon thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest unto the Lord, and put *Zadok* in his room, i. e. that Solomon deprived *Abiathar*, as plain as Words can express it.

Our Adversaries seem to collect, that the Scripture implies, that Solomon thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest, by confining him to *Anathoth*. Because it is said, Get thee to *Anathoth* — SO Solomon thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest. And this I suppose is the reason that Mr. Dodwel

(m) *Ibid.* p. 31.

twice prints the Particle SO in a different Character (*n*). Whereas it is not in the Original SO *Solomon*, but, *AND* *Solomon thrust out Abiathar* (*o*), as one of our very Adversaries happens to have observed (*p*), and as the Septuagint renders it (*q*), and also the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, and the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Versions.

Dr. Brett urges (*r*), "*Solomon* passed "no Sentence of Deprivation upon *Abiathar* : he only passed the Sentence of "Confinement.

Reply. We may conclude, that Sentence to have been passed, which we find to have been executed. And since the Scripture says expressly, that *Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest*, we may be sure, that Deprivation was part at least of *Abiathar's* Sentence.

But it is not certain, that *Solomon* sentenced *Abiathar* to be confined at *Anathoth*. For the Scripture does not say so. The Words are only ; *Go to Anathoth, to thy*

(*n*) *Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic.* p. 47, 51. Comp. *Dr. Brett's Indep.* p. 77.

(*o*) שגר.

(*p*) *Enquiry*, p. 14.

(*q*) καὶ ἐξέβαλε.

(*r*) *Ubi supra.*

Fields (f). But *Shimei's* Confinement to *Jerusalem* is very differently expressed in this very Chapter (*t*), *Dwell in Jerusalem, and go not forth thence any whither. For on the Day thou goest out, thou shalt surely die.* Therefore probably the Meaning of *Solomon's* Words, *Go to Anathoth to thy Fields* is, that he should leave the Pontifical Palace, which he had hitherto enjoyed at *Jerusalem*, and which was possibly the only House he had there, and go and live privately at his own House in the Country. Just as if the King and Parliament should, upon depriving *Dr. Sancroft* of his Archbishoprick and Palace at *Lambeth*, have said to him; "Go to your own House in *Suffolk*. For we might as justly put you to Death, as other Governments do such Subjects who disown their Authority. But we are more merciful.

2. *The Case of Schism* argues (*u*) in the following manner. "*Abiathar* had forfeited his Life for High-Treason: and when the King instead of that, did only remove him from a Place of too great

(f) ענתה לך על שרוד, 1 Kings ii. 26.

(t) Verses 36, 37.

(u) Pag. 19.

610 A TREATISE *against the*

“ Power and Trust to be left in the Hands
 “ of a Traitor, he ought thankfully to
 “ have acquiesced.” Another of our
 “ Adversaries (w), says to this Effect.
 “ The Sense of Solomon’s Words, as the
 “ lxxii. render them is, *Go to Anathoth.*
 “ *For else thou art a Man of Death this very*
 “ *Day; and if thou dost so, I will not put*
 “ *thee to Death.* So that Abiathar was
 “ put to his Option, whether he would
 “ retire from his Office or suffer Death,
 “ and his Priesthood determined by his
 “ own voluntary Cession.

Reply 1. The lxxii. thus render the
 Words. *Run thou to Anathoth to thy*
Field; For thou art a Man of Death this
Day, (i. e. thou now deservest to die), *and I*
will not put thee to Death, because thou barest
the Ark (x). So that there is no consider-
 able Difference between *their* Version,
 and *ours*, and the *Original*, except that
 they transpose the Words *this Day* from
 a subsequent Clause to an antecedent one.
 And it is clear from the *Original*, and from

(w) Solomon and Abiathar quoted in Dr. Hody’s *Case of Sees*, &c. p. 19. Add Mr. Earbery’s *Old Constitution vindicated*. p. 89.

(x) Απότρεξέ σου εἰς Ἀναθώθ εἰς ἀγρόν σου, ὅτι κίβητ' Ἰα-
 νάτῃ εἴ σὺ εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ, καὶ ἔθ' θανάτωσιν σε. ὅτι ἔχεις
 τὴν κιβωτὸν, κ. τ. λ.

the Consent of other Translations (y), *first* that the Scripture does not say, that Solomon gave Abiathar any Option, nor that Abiathar resigned or relinquished his High-Priesthood; but that Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest: and, *secondly*, that the Scripture does not say, that Solomon did not put Abiathar to Death, because he chose to resign his Office, but because he bare the Ark before David. So that the only Question here is, whether we will believe Scripture or our Adversaries?

Reply 2. Our Adversaries under this and the former Argument maintain, that Kings have Authority to punish Bishops with Banishment, Imprisonment, or Death; whereby they have shewn, that their Doctrine is perfectly to no Purpose, except to hurt themselves, and have been so kind to point out to the Civil Government, a Way to deprive Bishops in effect, tho' not directly. For a Bishoprick is, as well as the High-Priesthood was, a Place of too great Power and Trust to be left in the Hands of a disloyal Man. Suppose then that a King could not deprive disloyal Bishops, he must make Disloyalty in Bishops capital; since

(y) Vulg. Lat. Chald. Syr. Arab.

it would be necessary to remove such Bishops, and there would be no other lawful Way of doing it. And then the King might quickly prevent or end such Schism as this; either by executing such Bishops, or by accepting their Resignations.

But our Author tells us (z), *the worst of their Enemies can't say, this is their Case, viz. that the Laws of God and the Land would justify the King in taking away their Lives.*

Reply. Their Enemies say, that they are guilty of refusing to swear Allegiance to their rightful King; and does our Author think that no Crime? The Common Law, tho' it will not ordinarily permit Persons to take an Oath in other Cases till they are older, requires all Men above the Age of Twelve Years to swear Obedience to the King (a); and *Fleta* (b) seems to make the Punishment of Refusal to be Banishment. And by 7 Jac. 1. Cap. 6. All Ecclesiastical Persons refusing the Oath of Obedience therein prescribed, incur a Premunire; and the Judgment of a Premunire is, that the Defendent shall forfeit

(z) *Case of Schism*, p. 19.

(a) *Coke upon Littleton* 172. b. *Fleta* L. i. c. 27. Sect. 4.

(b) *Ibid.*

his Lands and Goods to the King, and be put out of his Protection, and be imprisoned during his Pleasure (c). But if it were not punishable by the Laws as they stand at present, the Legislative Power might as justly make it capital, as counterfeiting the King's Coin, and the like Crimes. And if such Bishops could not otherwise be removed, the Legislators might perhaps be moved to think it necessary to make such a Law. And are not those Nonjurors infatuated who would persuade the Government that it is necessary to make it Capital to refuse the Oaths? Is it not happy for them, that our Government is so tender as not to be provoked to such Extrémities? And ought not the Nonjuring Bishops, as well as *Abiathar*, to have thankfully acquiesced, when our Legislative Power made a Law to take away their Dioceses, instead of making a new Law to take away their Lives, or putting in Execution the standing Law of imprisoning them during Pleasure?

3. Several of our Adversaries (d) argue, that *Abiathar* was not deprived of the High-Priesthood, but of the subordinate

(c) Coke upon Littleton 129 b.

(d) Mr. Collier's Dictionary in *Abiathar*. Dr. Brett's *Indep. &c.* p. 78. Mr. Dodwel, p. 58.

Government of the Eight Courses of *Ithamar's* Line.

Reply 1. If *Abiathar* had been Governor of the Eight Courses of *Ithamar's* Line, our Adversaries could not from thence have concluded, that he was not High-Priest, because they say that *Zadok* was both High-Priest and Governor of the Courses of *Eleazar's* Line. And therefore they ought under this Head to have brought *some* Proofs at least, to have rendered it more probable, that *Abiathar* was deprived of this secondary Government, than that he was deprived of the High-Priesthood. But they do not pretend to offer one Proof of this: Neither do they produce one Argument, that *Abiathar* really had this Government of *Ithamar's* Line, except 1 *Chron.* xxiv. 3, &c. (e), which very Passage clearly proves, that *Abiathar* was not, but that his Son *Ahimelech* was, the Chief of *Ithamar's* Line under the proper High-Priest, as I have shewn already (f).

Reply 2. Solomon put *Zadok* the Priest in the room of *Abiathar*: Therefore *Abiathar* must be deprived of that Office into which *Zadok* succeeded, but *Zadok* did not succeed into the Government of *Ithamar's* Line. For it is a.

(e) Vid. Enquiry, &c. p. 12.

(f) Supra p. 581.

greed that *Zadok* was High-Priest *after* this: And *before* it he must be either High-Priest or not. If not, then he succeeded into the High-Priesthood, and *Abiathar* was deprived of it: if he were High-Priest *before*, then *Ithamar's* Family was under him before as their *Father*, and to have made him their subordinate Governour would have been to have degraded him from the Office of High-Priest to that of second Priest, as Dr. Brett himself expresses it (g).

Our Adversaries answer to this Effect, that the Care of the Subordinate Government of *Ithamar's* Line was added to *Zadok's* Pontifical Office; as in the Vacancy of the See of *London*, or the Disability of its Bishop to perform his Office, the Care of that Diocese would devolve to the Archbishop of *Canterbury* (h).

Reply. Our Adversaries do not offer the least Proof this, and the contrary is certain. It is probable that *Zadok's* being put in *Abiathar's* room, was an Advancement to the High-Priesthood, because it is expressed in the same Verse, and almost in the same Words, as *Benaiah's* being raised from be-

(g) Pag. 78.

(h) Dr. Brett *Ibid.* Mr. Collier in *Abiathar*.

ing an *inferior* to be the *Chief* General. But it is *certain*, because as I have before shewn, this was the Completion of the Prophecy concerning *Eli*: and the Meaning of that Prophecy was, that *Eli's* Family should lose the proper High-Priesthood, and another Family obtain it; and it would be the highest Absurdity to suppose that Prophecy fulfilled, barely by adding the Burden of an inferior Sacerdotal Office to him who was before, according to their Supposition, the proper High-Priest.

And after all, supposing *Solomon* to have deprived *Ahiathar* only of the subordinate Government of *Ithamar's* Line; this would have been a plain Instance from Scripture of a wise and pious King's depriving an inferior Priest, and putting another in his Room. And many of the principal Objections which are made against the Prince's having a Right to deprive Bishops, conclude as strongly against *Solomon's* having an Authority to deprive an inferior Priest. For Instance,
 " For *Solomon* to deprive an inferior
 " Priest, was, according to the reasoning of
 " our Adversaries, to disobey One of his
 " Spiritual Governours in that very Re-
 " spect wherein he was his Governour:
 " It was to take away what he never
 " gave, and therefore could not right-
 fully

“ fully take away. If Solomon had such
 “ a Power over the Priests; then the I-
 “ dolatrous Princes of the Jews, must
 “ have had the same. If Solomon might
 “ deprive One inferior Priest, he might
 “ as well have deprived All, and there-
 “ by have destroyed the Church. If
 “ the Jewish Church were so dependent
 “ on the State; then the Members of
 “ it were a Part of the Civil Constitu-
 “ tion, and by Consequence like other
 “ Civil Societies, might be disfranchised
 “ and disincorporated at Pleasure by the
 “ Sovereign Civil Power.” Now since
 these Arguments do not disprove, that
 Solomon had Authority to deprive inferi-
 or Priests: The like Arguments cannot
 disprove, that Christian Kings have Au-
 thority to deprive Bishops.

4. Our Author says (i), that Abia-
 thar was not deprived, but suspended from
 the Execution of his Office.

Reply. I have before (k) observed,
 that a judicial Suspension being a Tem-
 porary Deprivation, none can rightfully
 suspend, but those who can deprive: So
 that Solomon must have had Authority to

(i) *Case of Schism*, p. 19.

(k) *Supra*, p. 146.

deprive, if he had Authority to suspend. Besides, our Author says, that *Abiathar* was become too Scandalous to discharge his Office, and only pretends, that he continued to possess the Title and Revenue of High-Priest: So it was such a Suspension as requir'd another to be put in his Room. And I desire to know, whether when a Bishop is so suspended, it does not become necessary for the Church also, to elect and consecrate another in his Stead?

Fourthly, Some of our Adversaries maintain, that *Abiathar* was not deprived by King *Solomon*.

And 1. They argue that a King of the *Jews*, had not Authority to deprive, and that therefore *Solomon* did not deprive *Abiathar*.

Reply. Since the Scripture plainly relates, that *Solomon* did deprive *Abiathar*: And God's Prophets and Whole Church communicated with his Successor *Zadok*, and thereby, according to the Principles of our Adversaries, approved of *Solomon's* Proceedings: It would much better become our Adversaries from hence to conclude that the *Jewish* King had Authority to deprive: Than to conclude that *Solomon* did not deprive *Abiathar*, contrary to the expresse Testimony of
Scrip-

Scripture, because *Solomon's* doing so, does not suit with their *Hypothesis* concerning the Authority of the *Jewish* Kings in Ecclesiastical Matters.

Mr. *Dodwel*, is One who endeavours to prove (1), that *Jewish* Kings had not Authority to deprive. But his Arguments under this Head, being the same with Those which he and our other Adversaries bring to prove that Christian Kings cannot deprive Bishops, have been refuted in their proper Places.

Another of our Adversaries endeavours to prove the same, from the Authority of the *Rabbies*, who, as he pretends (m), say, that in Capital Causes, it was lawful only for the *Sanhedrim* to judge the High-Priest.

Reply. We may here apply, what Mr. *Dodwel* says of the *Rabbies* in another Case (n). "They had no Books to inform them in this Matter more than we, no other Coæval Writings but the Scriptures, which no where assert any such Matter."

The Enquirer pretends to make this Point out from Scripture, by the follow-

(1) *Defence of Vindie.* p. 38. &c.

(m) *Unity of Priesthood*, p. 34.

(n) *Defence of Vindie.* p. 54.

ing Arguments. "It is enough, *says he* (*) , to shew the High-Priest was Supreme, that God was pleased to appear upon the Mercy-Seat to him. *Lev.* xvi. 1, &c.

Reply. I suppose the Enquirer means, that the High-Priest alone entered into the Holy of Holies: Which is a good Argument that he was Supreme in discharging Sacred Ministrations; but no Proof, that the Prince was not Supreme in Ecclesiastical Causes.

The Enquirer proceeds, "The Prince was to Govern by a Law, of which the Priest had the Custody, and of which he was the Interpreter."

Reply. The *first* of these Arguments, would as well prove that the Keepers of our Records and Acts of Parliament; and the *second*, that our Judges, are Supreme in England, in Civil Matters.

Lastly, The Enquirer after *Bellarmin* (o), uses the following Argument, "The Prince was to go out and come in at the Word of the Lord by the Priest. *Numb.* xxvii. 21.

(*) *Enquiry*, p. 15, 16.

(o) *De Romano Pontifice*, L. 2. c. 29.

Reply.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 621

Reply. The Text is, *He (Joshua) shall stand before Eleazar the Priest, who shall ask for him the Judgment of Urim, before the Lord: At his (the Lord's) Word, shall they go out, and at his Word, they shall come in, both he (Joshua) and all the Children of Israel with him, even all the Congregation.*

Here we learn indeed, that *Joshua* and all *Israel*, were to go out and come in at the Word of the Lord, declar'd by the *Urim* and *Thummim*, which were in the Breast-Plate worn by the High-Priest. And this proves that God was Supreme, but not that the High-Priest was, any more than that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were so.

This could have no Relation to the High-Priest's Office as such: Because that Office subsisted for many Ages without the *Urim* and *Thummim*, which it is certain did not appear in the Time of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (p), and it is on all Hands confessed, that they never appeared after the *Babylonish* Captivity.

If this proved any Thing, it would prove the High-Priest to have been Supreme in Civil and Military, as well as

(p) V. *Ezra* ii. 63. *Nehem.* vii. 65.

Ecclesiastical Matters. For the Prince was to be govern'd by the Judgment of *Urim*, in both the former as well as the latter. Nay, if we consider the Instances recorded in Scripture of Secular Governours asking the Judgment of *Urim*, we shall find that they did it, chiefly, if not only, in Civil and Military Matters.

Lastly, Supposing this to prove, that the High-Priest was Supreme, it will only prove that he was so, when he gave Divine Responses, as *Jeremiah* the Priest (q) and others were, when they acted as Prophets. But would any one be so absurd to conclude, that because *Jeremiah* was over the Nations and over the Kingdoms (r), when he delivered God's Prophecies: therefore he was over them also, when considered barely in his *Sacerdotal* Character?

2. Our Adversaries maintain that *Abiathar* was deprived by the Church; and therefore not by King *Solomon*. This they endeavour to make out by Two Arguments.

(q) Vid. *Jer.* i. 1.

(r) Vid. *Jer.* i. 10.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 623

1. One of our Adversaries (f) thus argues. "Josephus (t) says, that before ever Solomon sent Benaiah to fall upon Joab, he first sent to fetch him from the Altar, in order to bring him to the Seat of Judicature, to purge himself if he could. And if this Formality was used towards Joab, it's probable the like was used toward Abiathar also, before he was thrust from the Priesthood.

Reply. It is more probable that Josephus meant a Civil Seat of Judicature (u), than an Ecclesiastical one. But whatever he meant, it is certain he was mistaken. For the Account which the Scripture gives us is this, Joab fled, and caught hold on the Horns of the Altar. Then Solomon sent Benaiah, saying, Go fall upon him. And Benaiah came to the Tabernacle of the Lord, and said unto him, thus saith the King, Come forth. And he said, Nay, but I will die here, 1 Kings ii. 28, 29, 30. Whence it is clear, that Solomon's first and principal Command to Benaiah was, Go fall upon Joab: and the Command to Joab to come

(f) *Unity of Priesthood*, p. 35.

(t) *Archæol. L. 8. c. 1.* Πάμψας Βαναΐαν, ἐκίλευσεν ἀναστήσαντά αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ δικαστήριον ἄγειν, ὡς ἀπολογησόμενον.

(u) The Word used by Josephus is δικαστήριον, not συνέδριον.

forth

forth had no relation to his *Trial*, but only to the *Place* of his Execution: and the undoubted Occasion of it was, because it was not usually thought proper to execute Criminals at the Altar (w).

3. Our Author (x), after the *Jesuits Salianus* (y) and *Menochius* (z), thus argues: "How know our Adversaries that the Church was not concerned in deposing *Abiathar*?"

Reply. I know that King *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar*, because the Scripture plainly says so; but the Scripture does not say, that the Church deposed him; and how then knows he, that she had any Hand in it? It is astonishing to see Men reason thus without any Foundation at all, when the Scripture plainly represents, that *Solomon* as sole Master and Judge of the Affair, declared *Abiathar* to be worthy of one Punishment, but that of his Royal Prerogative he remitted that, and inflicted a milder: and then it relates expressly, not that the Church, but that *Solomon thrust him out*: and for any thing appears, our

(w) V. *Exod.* xxi. 14. 2 *Kings* xi. 15. Comp. 1 *Kings* i. 50.

(x) *Case of Schism*, p. 19.

(y) *Annal. ad an.* 3. *Salomonis*. N. 15.

(z) *In Locum*.

Adversaries might as well have concluded, that the Church had a Hand in condemning *Adonijah* and *Joab*.

Our Author thus endeavours to confirm his Argument, "It is reasonable to believe that the Church ejected him, because his Crime was so notorious."

Reply. It is reasonable to believe the Church did not eject him, because the Scripture says nothing of it, but only that *Solomon* ejected him.

Our Author himself seems conscious of the Weakness of this, and in the following Words is willing to compound the Matter, "If there be nothing for what I have said, there is nothing against it; and so at best the Matter remains doubtful."

Reply. There is *this* against it, that there is *nothing* for it. I always thought, that only such Facts had been reckoned *doubtful*, which had had *some* Arguments for them. By this Method a Man might out of Scripture prove any thing almost to be at least *doubtful*; for Instance, that *St. Paul* preached at *Jamaica*; for if there be nothing for it, there is nothing against it. Let us turn the Tables, and suppose that the Scriptures had, without mentioning *Solomon*, only said, that the *Jewish* Church had deposed *Abiathar*: would our Author have allow'd, that *Solomon* had a

S f Hand

Hand in it, because there was nothing in Scripture to the contrary?

Upon the whole it appears plainly from Scripture, not that the Church, but that *Solomon* formally deprived *Abiathar* of the proper High-Priesthood: And the only Question upon this Head seems to be, Whether we shall pay most Regard to Scripture, or to the groundless Imaginations of our Adversaries: and to shew this the more clearly, I shall conclude this Head with the Scripture Account of this Fact.

Adonijah had conspired to obtain the Kingdom in the latter end of *David's* Reign, and *Joab* and *Abiathar* were of his Party. Hereupon *David* immediately constituted *Solomon* King (a). Upon *David's* Death, *Adonijah* cunningly prevailed upon *Bathsheba* to ask her Son *Solomon* to give him to Wife *Abisbag*, who had been Wife or Concubine to *David* (b). Now to take the Concubines of the late King, was one Way of claiming the Kingdom (c). *Solomon* perceiving that *Adonijah* was reviving his Preten-

(a) 1 Kings i. 5, &c.

(b) 1 Kings ii. 13, &c.

(c) 2 Sam. iii. 7. xii. 8. xvi. 21.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 627

ces to the Crown, and that Joab and Abiathar were in the Plot with him, answered his Mother; *Why dost thou ask Abiathar the Shunammite for Adonijah? Ask for him the Kingdom also, (for he is mine elder Brother), even for him and for Abiathar the Priest, and for Joab the Son of Zeruiah. And Solomon immediately commanded Adonijah to be put to Death. And unto Abiathar the Priest said the King, Get thee to Anathoth unto thine own Fields, for thou art worthy of Death (Heb. a Man of Death); but I will not at this Time put thee to Death, because thou barest the Ark of the Lord God before David my Father, and because thou hast been afflicted in all wherein my Father was afflicted. SO (Heb. AND) Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord, that he might fulfil, (rather thereby fulfilling), the Word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the House of Eli in Shiloh. Then Solomon commanded Benaiah saying, Go, fall upon Joab: and he fell upon him and slew him. And the King put Benaiah in his room over the Host; and Zadok the Priest did the King put in the room of Abiathar (d).*

(d) 1 Kings ii. 22, &c.

Thus I have shewn both that *Abiathar* was High-Priest, and that *Solomon* deprived him of that Office.

III. Our Adversaries answer, that supposing both these Things to be true, we cannot from thence conclude, that Kings may deprive Bishops. To make out which, *one* questions whether *Solomon* acted justly in Deposing *Abiathar*; Some imagine, that *Solomon* had in this Case more Authority than Princes generally have; and Others plead, that the Nature of the *Jewish* Church and Priesthood was so different from the Christian, that Kings might have Authority to deprive *Jewish* Priests, and yet not have Authority to deprive Christian Bishops.

I. Mr. *Dodwel* (e) argues thus. *This Fact is barely related in the Scripture, without any Censure on it, whether it was well or ill done: and therefore no Inference can be drawn from it.*

Reply 1. This is an Instance from Scripture of Deprivation by *Solomon*, a wise and pious Prince, and who was from the Beginning the Beloved of God (f), and had not yet forfeited that glorious Privilege, but had just received the Kingdom in consequence of God's former Pre-

(e) *Defence of Vindic.* p. 37.

(f) 2 Sam. xii. 24, 25.

ference of him to his elder Brethren, and of his *late* gracious Providence in crushing *Adonijah's* Conspiracy at the first, and discovering this Attempt to revive it. And tho' God afterward severely rebuked and punished him for other Actions: yet as Mr. *Dodwel* owns, he is no where *censured* for this: but on the contrary we find in the very next Chapter, that God favoured him with appearing to him (g). Now our Adversaries object, that we produce no Example for the first Three Hundred Years after Christ; when it was next to morally impossible that there should be any Example on either side, because there were then no Christian Kings. But this is a much earlier Precedent. And if they were able to urge such an one in their Defence, we should be more often upbraided with acting contrary to Primitive Practice; since they have the Modesty to upbraid us often with it, tho' we have produced many ancient Examples in our Defence, and they have been several times challenged to shew one Instance of the ancient Church's disowning a High-Priest or a Bishop, because put into the Place

(g) 1 Kings iii. 5.

of another deposed by the Civil Authority (*h*), and have not yet been able to do it.

Reply 2. *Solomon* did not only depose *Abiathar*, but put *Zadok* in his room, and he was acknowledged by all the Congregation of *Israel* (*i*), and as our Adversaries contend, his Descendents succeeded him. Supposing then *Solomon* not to have had competent Power to deprive *Abiathar*, it plainly follows, either that the whole Church of God was Schismatical for communicating with the Schismatical Intruder *Zadok*; which is absurd: or else, that the Church may own the Successor of a Bishop deprived by an incompetent Power.

2. Some of our Adversaries endeavour to prove that *Solomon* had in this Case a different Authority from what Princes generally have, by the following Arguments.

1. "*Solomon* deprived *Abiathar* as a Prophet (*k*).

(*h*) V. Dr. Hody's *Case of Sees*, &c. in the *Preface*, and p. 41. *Reflections on Remarks on the 8th Occasional Paper*, &c. p. 27.

(*i*) V. 1 *Chron.* xxix. 10, 11.

(*k*) *Bellarmin. de Romano Pontifice*. L. 2. c. 29. *Mr. Collier's Dictionary in Abiathar. Bishop of Bangor's Arguments considered*, p. 27. *Smith's Consideration of the Bishop of Bangor's Preservative*, p. 25.

Reply.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 631

Reply. Supposing *Solomon* to have been then a Prophet, there is no more in the History to shew, that he acted as such in this Affair, than in causing *Adonijah* and *Joab* to be executed, and putting *Benaiab* in *Joab's* room. And our Adversaries would do well to consider, whether in representing *Abiathar* to have been deprived by *Solomon* as a Prophet, tho' they have no Reason for it from Scripture, except that he acted as such in some other Instances, they do not weaken the Arguments brought by themselves, to prove the standing Orders of the Christian Ministry from the Practice of the Apostles, and their immediate Successors, who are known to have had an extraordinary Divine Commission in several other Cases.

But *Solomon* does not appear to have been a Prophet till after this. For we are told (1), that after *Solomon* had finished the Temple, *The Lord appeared to him the SECOND time, as he had appeared to him in Gibeon.* From whence many Commentators (m) collect that time at *Gibeon* to have been the FIRST. But that is recorded after his Deprivation of *Abia-*

(1) 1 Kings ix. 2.

(m) *Lyranus, Tostatus Abulensis, & Poole in locum.*

thar (n). Indeed it is said (o), that the Word of the Lord came to Solomon while he was building the Temple between these two Times. But to reconcile these Passages Commentators (p) have observed, that the last mentioned was not a Revelation made immediately to Solomon himself, but a Message sent to him by a Prophet.

“2. The Scripture expressly relates (q),
 “that Solomon deposed Abiathar, that he
 “might fulfill the Word of the Lord which
 “he spake concerning the House of Eli
 “in Shiloh, and which he spake by more
 “Prophets than one (r), with this Addi-
 “tion, which shewed it to be the unalter-
 “able Will of God, that he had sworn un-
 “to the House of Eli, That the Iniquity of
 “Eli’s House should not be purged with Sa-
 “crifice nor Offering for ever. And these
 “solemn Declarations of the Will of God
 “must oblige all to be governed by them:
 “but wicked Saul took no notice of
 “them (s).

(n) Viz. 1 Kings iii. 5.

(o) 1 Kings vi. 11, 12.

(p) Vatab. upon 1 Kings vi. 11. and Poole upon 1 Kings ix. 2.

(q) 1 Kings ii. 27.

(r) Vid. 1 Sam. ii. 27. iii. 11.

(s) Mr. Whiston, p. 100, 101. Mr. Dodwel’s Defence of Vindic. p. 51.

Reply. Neither did *David*, nor *Samuel* who was one that delivered this Prophecy, take such Notice of it as to attempt to fulfill it. And the Reason undoubtedly was, because God had not particularly commanded them to do it, and *Abiathar* had not by his Crimes deserved Deprivation, or if he had, it was not then for the Interest of the Church or State to deprive him.

For when God foretells that he will do such a thing, this is such a Will of God as a Man has no Authority to execute, much less is he *obliged* to execute it: unless God extraordinarily command him, or he have an ordinary Commission to do it, as we say the Kings of the *Jews* had to deprive Priests for Treason. God had unalterably promised that he would *rend the Kingdom of Israel from Saul, and give it to David* (1). And *David's* Followers were of the Opinion of our Adversaries, and exhorted him, when he happened to have *Saul* in his Power, to kill him and fulfill the Prophecy. But *David* knowing full well, that the bare Prediction of this did not authorize him to execute it without a Command, answered, *The Lord forbid that I*

(1) 1 Sam. xv. 28, 29. xvi. 1, 13.

should do this Thing. The Lord shall smite him, or his Day shall come to die, or he shall descend into Battel and perish (u). So God foretold that he would cut off Ahab's Posterity (w); yet it did not therefore become lawful for any one to kill them; and this Prophecy was not fulfilled, till Jehu had a particular Commission from God to do it (x). And where Men have without a Commission executed the unalterable Will of God, they have not been justified in so doing. God foretold that he would destroy Jeroboam's Posterity. And Baasha killed Nadab, the last King of that Family, and fulfilled the Prophecy. Yet God denounced severe Judgments against Baasha, because he killed him, as well as for his other Crimes (y). Christ foretold that he should be betrayed to the Chief Priests; nay, he particularly told Judas himself, that he should be the Person who should betray him; and yet he pronounces, *Wo unto that Man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed* (z). And as Judas was a Traitor for fulfilling this Prophecy: So

(u) 1 Sam. xxiv. 4, 6, 7. xvi. 8--11.

(w) 1 Kings xxi. 21.

(x) 2 Kings ix. 7.

(y) 1 Kings xv. 28, 29. xvi. 7.

(z) Matt. xx. 18, 19. xxvi. 24, 25. John xiii. 26, 27:

we may conclude that Solomon would have been a Schismatick, tho' he had *designed* never so much to fulfill the Prophecy concerning *Eli*, but that he had an ordinary Authority as King to deprive *Abiathar*.

Yet even this is not certain, that Solomon had any *Design* to fulfill this Prophecy, but only to punish Treason and establish his Kingdom (a). For the Expression *THAT* he might fulfill the Word of the Lord, necessarily signifies, that he accomplished the Prophecy by that Action: but not that he designed to accomplish it. Mr. Dodwel (b) owns, "I know very well, that this Particle *THAT* is used in the New Testament, when a Prophecy was fulfilled in the Event, tho' he who fulfilled it knew nothing of the Matter (c)." And it is more clearly so in the *Old Testament*. For the Word which we translate, *that he might fulfill*, is the Infinitive *למלא* and may, I conceive, be more properly rendered *Fulfilling*. For the Infinitive does in Hebrew often signify the same with, and is translated by, the

(a) Vid. 1 Kings ii. 21, 26, 46.

(b) *Defence of Vindict.* p. 51.

(c) V. Matt. xxvii. 35. Add Matt. ii. 23. John xii. 37, 38. xviii. 31, 31.

Participle of the Present Tense (d). And according to this Version, the Words will run thus. *Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord, thereby fulfilling the Word of the Lord.* In like manner it is said, that *the King of the Chaldees carried away the Jews to Babylon TO FULFILL the Word of the Lord by the Mouth of Jeremiah (e).* Where the Word which we render TO FULFILL is למלא, and ought rather, I presume, to be rendered FULFILLING. However this is certain, that it is the very same Verb, and of the same Conjunction, Mood and Tense with, and only differs in Termination from, the Word, which when applied to *Solomon* we translate, *that he might fulfill.* And therefore since it would be absurd to suppose that the King of the Chaldees intended to accomplish *Jeremiah's* Prophecy, we cannot from this Expression infer, that *Solomon* had any thoughts of fulfilling the Prophecy concerning *Eli*.

(d) Thus the Infinitive למלא is translated, *saying* 1 Kings viii. 15. and almost in every Chapter of the Bible. So שׁמַע is rendered *Hearkening*, Psal. ciii. 20. And many more Infinitives in other Passages of Scripture would, as I apprehend, be better translated, if they were rendered by the Participle of the Present Tense. Vid. Psal. lxxviii. 18. lxi. 8. civ. 14, 15. Dan. ix. 13.

(e) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

3. To prove that *Solomon* had a particular Command, Mr. Collier (f) writes to this effect, "*Solomon's* deposing *Abiathar* and putting *Zadok* in his room, ought to be reckoned a principal Part of the new ordering the Courses of the Priests, which was particularly commanded by God to *David*, and by *David* to *Solomon*, and accordingly the Scripture informs us that *Solomon* put this Order in Execution, 2 Chron. viii. 14.

Reply. The Enquirer (g) endeavours to prove from the same Text, that *Abiathar* was not deprived at all. And indeed it equally proves both, or rather neither. For neither is *Abiathar* nor *Zadok*, nor the High-Priest named in it. And there is no Appearance that when *David* appointed the Courses of the Priests, he gave any Directions relating to the High-Priests, or their Office, which had been particularly determined by God in *Moses's* time, or relating to the Depriving or not Depriving any Priests whatsoever: but only prescribed in what order the inferior Priests and *Levites* should minister in

(f) In *Abiathar*, in the last Volume of his Dictionary.

(g) Page 13.

the Temple, a Point which had not been regulated before. And all which this Text relates is, that *Solomon* executed *David's* Commands about this Matter. And besides, it relates that he executed them after the Building of the Temple, which was many Years after *Abiathar* was deprived.

3. Our Adversaries plead, that the Nature of the *Jewish* Church and Priesthood was so different from the Christian, that we cannot conclude that Kings have Authority to deprive Bishops, because they had Authority to deprive *Jewish* Priests. Of this our Adversaries bring several Proofs.

1. "The Center of Unity in the *Jewish* Church was not Personal, but Local, and was confined to the Temple at *Jerusalem*; therefore no Schism could follow from *Abiathar's* Punishment (b)." The Meaning of which is, that tho' Christians must, if they will continue in the Church, join in Communion with their respective Diocesan; yet the *Jews* were not obliged to communicate with any particular High-Priest, but only to sacrifice at the Temple at *Jerusalem*.

(b) *Mr. Earbery's Old English Constit. Vindic.* p. 89. Letter to Mr. Marshall, p. 27.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 639

Reply 1. They were obliged to do both. Dr. *Hickes* (i) and Mr. *Dodwel* (k) assert, "that the High-Priest answered our Christian Bishops as a Principle of the Unity of the Jewish Communion. And in this Point they were certainly in the right. For as all Sacrifices were to be offered at the Temple at *Jerusalem*; so they were to be offered by *Aaronical* Priests, and by them only. Some Sacrifices might be performed by inferior *Aaronical* Priests, and whoever joyn'd in such Sacrifices, communicated with the inferior Priests who sacrificed them, and thereby with the High-Priest, to whom those Inferiors were subject (l). Other Sacrifices were necessarily to be performed by the High-Priest, particularly that great Atonement which he made every Year for himself, and for the People when he entered into the Holy of Holies (m): which was a Type of Christ's Sacrifice of himself (n), and was by far the Principal of all the federal Rites of that Religion. So that the whole People of *Israel* were under a Necessity

(i) Page 67.

(k) *Defence of Vindic.* p. 53, and p. 38, &c.

(l) Vid. 1 *Chron.* xxiv. 19. *Num.* iii. 4.

(m) *Heb.* ix. 7.

(n) *Heb.* ix. 12.

of communicating with the High-Priest directly, as well as indirectly, when they communicated with inferior Priests.

Reply 2. Supposing that the *Jews* had not been obliged to communicate with the High-Priest: yet I have already shewn, that the whole People of *Israel*, *i. e.* the whole Church of God owned *Zadok's* Title; and thereby, according to our Adversaries, approved of his Deprivation, which it would be absurd to suppose they would have done, if it had not been rightful.

And whereas Mr. *Earbery* adds (o),
 “ The *Jewish* Ecclesiastical Polity was rather of a Civil Nature, than equivalent
 “ to ours at this Time; their High-Priest
 “ was of no Use but in the flourishing
 “ State of their Empire; and the Destruction of their Temple and of their
 “ Priesthood went hand in hand together;
 “ without the Temple, could be no Sacrifice, and without Sacrifice there
 “ could be no Priest, *i. e.* his Name and
 “ Character was lost without Employ:”
 This, if true, would only prove what we have already granted, that the *Jews* were bound to sacrifice at the Temple at *Jerusa-*

(o) Mr. *Earbery's* *Admonition to Dr. Kennet*, p. 100.
lem

tem, as well as to be in Communion with the proper High-Priest. But this is far from being true. For I have already had occasion to shew, that Priests might be hindered from officiating, and yet retain their *Name* and *Character*. And tho' they could not sacrifice but at the Temple: yet they had still much *Employ* in other Places, *viz.* to bless and teach the People. And the High-Priest also could give Responses by *Urim*, when he was distant from the Ark, as *Abiathar* several Times did. And when Men could not enjoy the Temple, they maintained Communion with the *Jewish* Church by being united to the Rightful High-Priest. Else *David* would have ceased to have been a Member of the Church of God, when *Saul* forced him to flee, and so would *Daniel*, *Ezekiel*, and other Holy Men, when the whole People of *Israel* was in the *Babylonish* Captivity.

2. Our Author (*p*) thus argues, "The
" High-Priesthood of the *Jews* was rather
" lodg'd in a Family than in a Person,
" and all the Family did partake of the
" Honour of it, and in some Cases did

(*p*) *Case of Schism*, p. 20. Vid. *Mr. Dodwel's Defence of Vindic.* p. 53---57.

642 A TREATISE against the

“ execute the Office: so that there was
 “ little or no Damage to the Church in
 “ removing any one High-Priest; because
 “ there were still others legally empower-
 “ ed to execute the same Office: But
 “ with a Bishop it is not so.

Our Author seems to mean, that the Inferior Priests could discharge all the Parts of the High-Priest's Office, and in the High-Priest's Absence had Authority so to do in their own Right, and without any new Commission; whereas a Bishop's Presbyters cannot perform any part of the Episcopal Office in their own Right, and there are some Parts of the Episcopal Office which they cannot be deputed to do, till they are ordain'd Bishops.

Reply 1. If this be our Author's Meaning, I have already shewn (*q*), that there is no Proof, that any inferior Priests could be deputed by the High-Priest to wear the Pontifical Vestments, and to give Responses by *Urim*, or to enter into the Holy of Holies; and the contrary seems certain. And much less could inferior Priests do these Things in their own

(*q*) *Supra.* p. 542, &c.

Right,

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 643

Right, and without any Deputation from, but in Opposition to the High-Priest, as Zadok must have done in this Case.

Reply 2. Supposing that inferior Priests might execute the High-Priest's Office. I reply; Archiepiscopacy is rather lodg'd in an Order than a Person; and all the Order partake of the Honour; and in some Cases may execute the Office: so that according to our Author, there is little or no damage to the Church in removing any Archbishop, because there are still others of the same Order who are legally impower'd to execute the same Office. And whereas our Author says, it is not so with a Christian Bishop who is a single Person, I imagine that Abiathar was as much a single Person, as Archbishop Sancroft, or any other Christian Bishop.

Reply 3. If, as our Author argues, Solomon might remove a High-Priest for a Civil Crime, because it was little or no Damage to the Church: This confirms my Argument, that Princes may deprive Criminal Bishops, because so to do is no Damage, but a Benefit both to Church and State. And if it were therefore no Damage to remove one High-Priest, because there were still others legally impower'd to execute the same Office: I conclude for the like Reasons, 1. That it is no Da-

mage to the Church, to deprive a few disloyal Bishops. For though none of a Bishop's Presbyters can supply his Place in their own Right; yet they may soon be impowered so to do, by being elected and ordained Bishops in his stead, or another Bishop may be translated into his See, or may be commissioned to execute all Episcopal Duties there, till a new Bishop shall be constituted. 2. That whensoever a Bishop is deprived, by Powers incompetent or Supreme *de facto*, the Church may and ought to elect a new Bishop in his room; because it is so far from being a Damage, that it is a very great Benefit to the Church to have a Bishop, who is at full Liberty to discharge his *whole* Function, rather than one who cannot *at all* perform *some* Parts, nor *conveniently any* Part thereof.

3. Our Author argues, that the High-Priest might be deposed by incompetent Powers, and yet no Schism follow, "because he had Substitutes provided to officiate for him when he could not execute his Office himself on account of his being unclean (*r*).

(*r*) *Case of Schism*, p. 20.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 645

Reply. There is not the least Proof of this in Scripture, as I have already observed. But supposing it to be true, I conclude by Parity of Reason, that a Bishop may be deprived, because another Bishop may presently be consecrated to supply his Place, or a Neighbouring Bishop may officiate in the Interim.

Thus it appears that none of these Arguments prove that Difference between the *Jewish* and the Christian Church and Priesthood, which our Adversaries contend for. On the contrary, I have before observed, that the High Priest's particular District was of Divine Institution, which a Bishop's Diocese is not. And therefore since *Solomon* did as King deprive *Abiathar* for Treason of the proper High-Priesthood; much more may a King deprive Bishops for Disloyalty.

The 7th *Objection* of our Author is,
“ That the Orthodox in *Constantinople*,
“ when their Oratories were taken from
“ them, did in their Distress communi-
“ cate with the Schismatical *Novatians*,
“ who did not differ at all from the
“ Orthodox in the Manner of their Wor-
“ ship (S).

(S) *Case of Schism*, p. 21.

This Practice of the Orthodox, he in his Answer condemns, and so do I too, because they ought not on any Pretence to have communicated with Schismatics. And therefore, since I have proved *these Nonconformists* to be Schismatics, and our Author neither has nor can prove *us* to be so; this ought to be a Warning to all Men not to communicate with them, though they differ but little from us in the Manner of their Worship. For this Reason the learned Mr. Dodwel, though agreeing with them in Matters of Civil Government, refused Communion with them: nay, he would not vouchsafe to call them *Brethren*, but *Adversaries*, and when he speaks most mildly of them, *Our late Brethren*.

The 8th Objection of our Author, p. 22. is, *that the Orthodox communicated with the Arians*. And his Answer is, *That the Arians were then only suspected, but not discovered, to be Hereticks: but that our Opinions and Uncanonical Practices are well known*. So that he takes it for granted, that as the *Arians* were Hereticks; so our Opinions are false, and our Practices uncanonical: but he has not proved this, and therefore to use his own Expression, *All this is nothing to the present Purpose*.

As

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 647

As to his 9th *Objection*, p. 24. I observe in general, that it is nothing to the Purpose, because he supposes, but does not prove, that we are in the wrong.

But to be particular; *Others*, says our Author, p. 24. *urge in their Defence several Practices in the Jewish Church, as the Sacrifices at Dan and Bethel.*

Reply. Is it credible, that any Man ever pretended to justify communicating with us, because the *Israelites* sacrificed to the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*? No. As the Design of the 8th *Objection* seems to be to represent us as bad as the *Arians*: so the Design of bringing in *this Objection*, was undoubtedly to compare the Church of *England* to Idolaters, and to threaten us with as severe Judgments as *Jeroboam* and the *Israelites* underwent; and on the other Hand to insinuate, that as God had still a Remnant among the *Israelites*, who kept themselves clear of *Jeroboam's Sin*, though they underwent many Hardships in doing it (1): so he has now a godly and much persecuted Remnant among the Nonjuring Nonconformists.

(1) Vid. *Case of Schism*, p. 25.

The Instance also of *Hezekiah's sending to invite all Israel and Judah to come up to the Passover at Jerusalem, and of his Messengers being mock'd and laugh'd at*, is undoubtedly introduced with no other Design, than to compare these *Nonconforming Nonjurors* to *Hezekiah's Messengers*, and us to the *Sons of Belial*, who mock'd and laugh'd at them (u).

The 10th *Objection*, p. 27. is, "That we may lawfully join in an unlawful Communion, provided the Heart and Consent go not along with it; because *Naaman* craves pardon for his going with his Master into the House of *Rimmon*, and bowing down himself there, as his Master leaned on his Hand, which shews his dislike of what he did; and yet the Prophet bids him *Go in Peace*, which seems to approve of his Practice, 2 Kings v. 18.

This Objection too, and all the Learning, which he is so liberal of in answering it, will be nothing to the Purpose, till he has as plainly proved our Communi-

(u) *Case of Schism*, p. 26. Those *Sons of Belial* who mock'd and laugh'd at *Hezekiah's Posts*, p. 27. The same we do, and I hope shall continue to do, tho' we are mock'd and laugh'd at, as *Hezekiah's Messengers* were.

on to be unlawful, as it is manifest, that the Worshipping at the House of Rimmon was Idolatrous.

I shall only observe, that our Author's first Explication of this Passage, p. 29. seems to be the true one, viz. "That Naaman should for the time to come wait on his Master to do the Office of a Servant, but not the Acts of a Worshipper, and that when he bowed himself down, as his Master lean'd on his Hand, he did it as a Civil Respect to his Master, and not as Religious Worship to the Idol; and that he craved Pardon for this, because it was liable to be misinterpreted." And I think our Author plainly mistaken, in chusing to render the Verb, not *when I shall bow*, but in the preterperfect Tense, *when I have bowed*, and in supposing, that Naaman begg'd Pardon for his former Errors in Worshipping Idols. For if Naaman had design'd that, he would not only have ask'd Pardon for the Idolatry he had committed, when he attended his Master, but also for those many times he had unquestionably been guilty of it, in his Master's Absence.

And now our Author proceeds to his Master-piece, his Finishing-Blow; which is to prove from the Second Canon, that
all

650 A TREATISE against the

all the Church of *England* are actually excommunicated. The Canon runs thus;
 “ Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that
 “ the King’s Majesty hath not the same
 “ Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical, that
 “ the Godly Kings had among the *Jews*,
 “ and Christian Emperors in the Primi-
 “ tive Church, or impeach in any Part
 “ his Legal Supremacy in the said Cause
 “ restored to the Crown, and by the
 “ Laws of the Realm therein establish’d;
 “ let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*,
 “ and not restored but only by the Arch-
 “ bishop after his Repentance and pub-
 “ lick Revocation of those his wicked
 “ Errors.

Who but a quick-sighted Man could have ever pry’d out such a Consequence from this Canon? But let us see how he deduces it, “ By King, mentioned in this
 “ Canon, is to be understood that Per-
 “ son, who is possess’d of the Throne,
 “ according to the Institution of the *Eng-
 “ lish* Hereditary Monarchy, whoever
 “ disowns such a King’s Authority, &c.
 “ by this Canon incurs the Sentence
 “ of Excommunication *ipso facto*, i. e.
 “ he ought to be treated as Excommu-
 “ nicate without farther judicial Process
 “ or Sentence. King *James* the Second
 “ was and his (pretended) Son is, such a
 “ King,

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 651

“ King. Therefore the Revolutionists
“ and the Compliers with the present
“ Government are, for disowning the
“ Authority of those (pretended) Kings,
“ actually Excommunicated.

In this Argument our Author is guilty of several Defects. He mistakes the Sense of *being excommunicated ipso facto*. The late King *James* when we disowned him, was not such a King as our Author describes: and the Pretender is not, nor ever was such a King. Besides, the Canon does not speak of the King's Person or Title, as our Author falsely imagines; but of the Authority belonging to the Crown: nor is the Canon directed against those who reject the Regal Authority in Civil Matters; but against such as our Adversaries, who deny the Supremacy of the Crown in Causes Ecclesiastical. But to be particular,

Answer 1. It has been observed by several, that tho' an Offender be decreed to be excommunicated *ipso facto*; yet he is not actually excommunicated, nor to be treated as such, before a Sentence Declaratory by the Judge. And indeed, such a Sentence seems necessary in common Justice, not only on account of the supposed Offender; but of the Congregation, which is bound to avoid an ex-
com-

communicated Person. And how should they avoid him, except they know of his being excommunicated; and how should they know of it, except it be declared?

Answer 2. Supposing, but not granting, that those who deny the Authority of a King possessed of the Throne according to our Constitution, are actually excommunicated by this Canon, I observe,

1. That our Author is very defective in his Attempts to prove, that the late King *James the Second* was a King, when we disown'd his Authority. *That King James the Second had a Right, says our Author, and continued claiming to his Death, none can deny:* whereby he seems to intend, that we should understand, *that none denies that King James the Second had a Right to his Death.*

That King *James the Second* once had a Right, I do not deny: but our Author knows many who deny, that he continued to possess that Right to his Death. It is true, that he claimed it so long, but that does not prove, that he had it. On the contrary, he had abdicated the Government, as the Lords and Commons declared, *i. e.* he had deposed himself: They did not, as our Author falsely charges them, deprive their Rightful King, but he deprived himself; and they did

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 653

did not disown his Authority till he had none. And since he thus ceas'd to have any Authority, the late King *William* was, and King *George* is, our rightful King: So that this Canon, if understood in our Author's Sense, does not excommunicate us, but the *Nonjurors* themselves.

And this Consequence is allow'd to be just in the *Dilemma* proposed in that Pamphlet, from which our Author has taken what he says upon this Argument, but thought fit to omit the first Branch of the *Dilemma*, which I shall therefore here insert. "The Main of the Controversy hangs much on this *Dilemma*; Either King *James* has lost his Right, or he has not; if he has, and King *William's* Right is good, the *Nonjurors* are excommunicated *ipso facto* by the Canon, and may be charged with the horrid Guilt of Schism (w).

2. Our Author says, the Canon means a King who is POSSESSED of the Throne; and it is plain that the same Convocation who made this Canon, and who probably knew their own Meaning, did

(w) Considerations upon the Second Canon, printed 1693. p. 5.

shortly after declare (x), " that Supreme
 " Authority, tho' unjustly gotten, or
 " wrung by Force from the true and
 " lawful Possessor, is, when thoroughly
 " settled, to be reverenc'd and obey'd
 " as God's Authority." If we should
 then suppose that the Revolutionists dis-
 possess'd their Rightful King; this would
 not, according to our Author's Words,
 and the Sense of that Convocation who
 made, and therefore best understood the
 true Importance of this Canon, excom-
 municate those, who disowned his Au-
 thority after he was deprived and dis-
 possessed.

3. King *James's* pretended Son is not
 such a King. For he neither has, nor
 ever had, any Right to this Crown: and
 it is manifest, that he is not, nor ever
 was, in *Possession* of it. It is plain then,
 according to our Author's own Account,
 that the Excommunication, which he
 fulminates against us, does not reach *us*,
 who do not disown, but the *Nonjurors*,
 who do disown, the King who is pos-
 sessed of the Throne, and such a King,
 as the Makers of this Canon undoubted-
 ly meant, tho' we should for Argument

(x) *Bishop Overall's Canons, Chap. 28.*

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 655

fake suppose him to be only a King *de facto*.

Ans. 3. Our Author is manifestly wrong in the Sense he gives of this Canon. According to him, the Design of the Canon is, to excommunicate those who should deny, that King *James* the First had a good Title to the Crown. This was what the Convocation, who made this Canon never dreamt of, and much less of excommunicating those, who should deny King *James* the Second's, or the Pretender's Title. But it is the King's Power, not his *Person* or *Title*, which the Canon speaks of; and the Meaning plainly is, that the Supremacy is a Branch of the Regal Power, that the King, whoever he is, or should be, is supreme in Ecclesiastical Matters.

Had the Convocation design'd to assert King *James* the First's Title, they would have undoubtedly asserted his Authority in Civil Matters as well as Ecclesiastical: but Civil Matters are not so much as once mention'd. I suspect our Author was aware of this. For in his Argument, having said, *whoever disowns his Authority*, he adds an *&c.* (p 32.) Had he mention'd at length, as the Canon does, *whosoever disowns his Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical*, every one would at first

first sight have perceiv'd, it had been nothing to his Purpose.

There are other Words in this Canon, which manifestly shew that it relates to the Regal Power. *Whoever shall hereafter affirm, that the King's Majesty hath not the same Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical,* then follows this Explanation, *or impeach any Part of his legal Supremacy in the said Cause restored, not to King James, but to the CROWN, and by the Laws of the Realm establish'd THEREIN, not in King James.*

Our Author proceeds, p. 33. *Nor is the Position in the First Canon short of the Second:* whereby he implies, that the first Canon is to the same effect as the Second. And so it is. Only the first Canon requires us, to acknowledge the King's Supremacy; and the second decrees, what Penalty the Impugners of it shall incur. Now the first Canon plainly speaks of the King's Power, not his Person or Title.

“ The Archbishop, &c. shall cause to
 “ be observ'd all Laws made for re-
 “ storing to the CROWN of this King-
 “ dom the ancient Jurisdiction over the
 “ State Ecclesiastical, and abolishing of
 “ all Foreign POWER repugnant to the
 “ same—Furthermore, All Ecclesiastical
 “ Persons shall teach—that no manner
 “ of

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 657

“ of Obedience is due to any such Foreign Power: but that the King’s Power within his Realms, is the highest Power under God.

Here it is manifest from the Words as well as the Sense; 1. That the Canon speaks of the King’s Power, not his Person or Title. 2. That this is spoken in Opposition to Foreign Power; and the Pamphlet before quoted *does not deny but that the Usurpations of the Court of Rome were the occasion of laying down the Position in the first Canon (1)*. Now no one can believe, that the Convocation meant to assert or deny any thing about the Person or Title of the then Pope, but about the Extent of the Papal Power and that it did not reach to this Kingdom.

Answ. 4. The first and second Canon were levell’d against those Persons who should reject the Supremacy of the Crown in Ecclesiastical Matters. This is what our Author cannot deny. And I add, that from what is above written it appears, that these Canons were levell’d against those Persons only. Our Author says (2), *It is easy to find out the Persons guilty of violating this Canon: and so say I too,*

(1) Considerat. upon 2d Canon. p. 6. (2) Pag. 33.

and that they are, our Author and his Adherents, who do not only deny the Rightful Title of our King, but reject the Supremacy of the Crown, which these Canons assert, and to which they have often subscribed. For by the Supremacy is meant, *That Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical which is restored to the Crown, and by the Laws of this Realm therein establish'd (a).* Which Authority our Adversaries deny; not only as to the Point of Lay-Deprivations, but in many other Respects. To pass by Mr. Dodwel, Dr. Hickes (b), calls these following Maxims *False and Unchristian*, viz. *that the Right of presenting Clerks to Cures is a Lay-Fee; that the King is Supreme Ordinary; that he has a Right to nominate Bishops in the manner enacted 25 H. 8. cap. 20.* All which are notorious Branches of the King's Supremacy.

And is it not now surprizing that our Adversaries should bring such an Argument? Men who can charge us with breaking Canons, by a far fetch'd and wrong Interpretation and false Application of them, when they themselves are

(a) Vid. 2d Canon.

(b) Pag. 28, 85, 146.

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 659

guilty of a notorious Violation of those very Canons according to their obvious and undoubted Sense, deserve a worse Name than I am willing to give them. But undoubtedly this was done only to frighten *ordinary Capacities*, *first*, by telling them very positively that they were all excommunicated; and *then* by representing the Consequences of Excommunication as dreadful as possible: With which Representation our Author concludes his Discourse. But since I have shewn, that the Sentence of Excommunication is due to our Adversaries and not to us, I do not think it needful for me, but for them, to consider what he says upon that Subject. Only I shall make an Observation upon one Passage of it.

Page 34. "When Excommunication falls to be a Clergyman's Lot, it makes fatal Work:" of which our Author gives *several* Instances; the second is (c), "Excommunication renders a Clergyman, so long as he continues in that State, incapable of any Ecclesiastical Benefice or Promotion; and if he assume any, his Institution is void."

(c) Page 35.

Here our Author has at once made void all the Church Preferments in *England*: So if a lucky Turn should come, our Adversaries will be provided for, and will share all our Bishopricks and Deaneries among them; and perhaps they have already done it often in Imagination. But I presume, notwithstanding these Threatenings, our Clergy will not be much afraid of losing their Benefices: and I would not advise our Adversaries to be over-confident of obtaining them: Because it is now Twenty six Years (*d*), since they have been flattered with that Prospect, and yet they seem farther than ever from the Enjoyment of them.

Pag. 33. "As to the popular Plea concerning Separation, that the original Question is only of Civil Concern — I beg it may be considered, That in the Opinion of the Church of *England*, which made the Canons, it was of such Concern, as to have the highest Censures of the Church interested in it.

Here our Author dares not deny, but that the Question upon which these Non-conformists divided from us, was partly *Civil*: but he attempts to prove, that it

(*d*) Considerations upon the second Canon, from whence our Author transcribed this Passage, were printed in 1693.

was also partly *Ecclesiastical*, because our two first Canons were made against those who should deny the King's Authority. Whereas I have fully shewn, that these Canons were made against those who should deny, that the Supremacy is a Branch of the Regal Power, and not against those who should deny the Title of any particular Person to the Regal Power: So that our Author's Proof is none at all: and since he has produced no Proof, we may presume, that he could produce none.

And as the Dispute was *originally* a Civil one, so it appears to have been *continued* for Civil Purposes, and out of a Regard to the Political Ends of a pretended Temporal Prince. For our Adversaries seem plainly to confess, that the Deprived Bishops performed the supposed Consecrations in Compliance with the late King *James's Desire* to have their pretended Church continued (*e*). Now a Popish Prince could not well *desire* this, except for Political Ends, or to hurt the Protestant Religion. And it is most *probable* that he desired it in hopes to reco-

(*e*) In constituting these Pastors, they (the Deprived Bishops) had regard to the Consent of him who desired the Continuance of that Church of *England* which was in Communion with them. *Dr. Hickey, p. 171.*

ver his lost Civil Cause by blending a Religious one with it. And it is *certain*, that of late this Controversy had slept for several Years, and was not revived, till there was no Prospect left of bringing in the Pretender any other Way, the late Rebellion being happily quelled.

And indeed it must be manifest to any unprejudiced Person, that our Adversaries could not by this Separation promote the Good of the Church. For she is much more hurt by this Schism, than she would have been by the Deprivations, supposing them to have been wrongful, since, as I have shewn, no Doctrines were concerned. And therefore the Deprived Bishops might have submitted, if they had pleased. For our Adversaries confess, that Bishops may acquiesce under Deprivations by incompetent Powers, where Faith and Worship are not affected (*f*). And since they might have submitted, they ought to have done it in this Case. For all Men, and especially Bishops, ought to do every thing which lies in their Power to promote the Good of the Church, and to prevent Schisms. And they cannot

(*f*) Vid. *Mr. Dodwel's Vindication*, &c. p. 13. *Mr. Kettlewel's Christian Communion*, Part 2. p. 11, 29. *Comp. Dr. Hickes*, p. 169, 170.

pretend

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 663

pretend, that it was or is in the Power of our Bishops to *prevent* or *end* this Schism. For if they had refused their Bishopricks, the Civil Powers would never have been so wanting to their own Preservation, as to have reinstated the Deprived Bishops; and much less will they now acknowledge the present pretended Nonjuring Bishops.

Upon the whole then it appears, that notwithstanding our Adversaries warm Pretences of Zeal for the Church, and their loud Clamours against us, it is they who have made the Church dependent on the State, and have sacrificed her Peace and Union to worldly Considerations; it is they who are guilty of wilfully occasioning the Schism at first, and of obstinately prolonging it afterward, when there was a fair Opportunity of putting an honourable End to it. And therefore, as *Solomon* discovered her who consented to divide the Child, not to be his true Mother; so we may, without Breach of Charity, conclude, that they are only spurious Sons of the Church, who perversely contrive to continue her Breaches.

Thus I have gone through my Subject; and I wish our Adversaries would read this Treatise without Prejudice, as it was written with a sincere Design to benefit them. Some of them are Objects of Compassion,

passion, in this respect, that it is their Zeal for Kings and Bishops which has misled them into Disloyalty and Schism; and that they have been drawn aside by the Misapplication of two very good Principles, *viz.* that Obedience is due to our Civil and Ecclesiastical Governours. But they would do well to reflect, that Zeal is often misguided: that among the many Divisions which are and have been in the World, the well-meaning Men on the mistaken side are generally deceiv'd by some among them, who make warm Pretences to very good Things: that as they think themselves in the right, so it is possible they may be in the wrong: that they have the more reason to suspect their Cause, because in this Point they differ from all Protestant Churches; and because their learned Leaders have been several times challenged to produce one Instance of the Church's acting like them, either before or since Christ, and have not yet done it: that if they should be mistaken, that Sin of Schism, which they so much abhor, lies at their own Door; that they are then guilty of rending Christ's Body, of disobeying their rightful Pastors, of deserting the Church themselves, and endeavouring to withdraw others from it, and lastly, of giving great Advantages to the

Non-Conforming Nonjurors. 665

the common Enemies of Episcopal Protestants: and that therefore it will behove them to consider impartially, not only the greatness of the Sin of Schism, but whether they themselves be guilty of it. And if they should once come to that happy Temper, I do not question, but they would quickly return to our Communion; and that our spiritual Fathers, instead of imposing hard Terms of Reconciliation, would receive them with open Arms, as the good Father in the Gospel did his repenting prodigal Son: and then we should again enjoy the Happiness of becoming one pure Flock, governed by the same Pastors upon Earth, and all united to the great Shepherd and Bishop of our Souls.

F I N I S.



X x

New-Capitulum Nonjurator 1665

the common Enemies of Episcopal Power:
 that: and that therefore it will be
 them to consider impartially, not only
 the greatness of the Sin of Schism, but
 whether they themselves be guilty of it.
 And if they should once come to this
 by Temper, I do not question, but they
 would find it to be a great Communion
 on; and that it is not only
 of imposing, but also of receiving
 on, would be a great Blessing to
 as the good Lord will. And when we
 his repenting prodigal son; and when we
 should again enjoy the Happiness of be-
 coming one pure flock, gathered by the
 same Pastor upon Earth, and all united
 in the great Shepherd and King of our
 Souls.



F I N I S

